UC SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY
D 000 916 545 7

THE MEMORIAL HISTORY OF BOSTON

1630 - 1880

F
73.3
W76
v.3

THE MEMORIAL HISTORY OF BOSTON.

And I will restore thy judges as at the first, and thy counsellors as at the beginning: afterward thou shalt be called . . . the faithful city. — ISAIAH I. 26.



BURNING OF CHARLESTOWN DURING THE BATTLE OF BUNKER HILL.

(Taken at the time by a British officer from Beacon Hill.)

THE

MEMORIAL

HISTORY OF BOSTON,

INCLUDING

SUFFOLK COUNTY, MASSACHUSETTS.

1630—1880.

EDITED

By JUSTIN WINSOR,

LIBRARIAN OF HARVARD UNIVERSITY.

IN FOUR VOLUMES.

VOL. III.

THE REVOLUTIONARY PERIOD.

THE LAST HUNDRED YEARS. PART I.

Issued under the business superintendence of the projector,

CLARENCE F. JEWETT.

BOSTON:

JAMES R. OSGOOD AND COMPANY.

1881.

Copyright, 1881,
By James R. Osgood & Co.

All Rights Reserved.

CONTENTS AND ILLUSTRATIONS.

FRONTISPIECE. View of Charlestown during the Battle of Bunker Hill, taken from Beacon Hill (described on p. 87) . . . . . *Facing titlepage*

INTRODUCTION.

MAPS OF THE REVOLUTIONARY PERIOD, i; PLANS OF THE BATTLE OF BUNKER HILL, i; BRITISH LINES ON BOSTON NECK, v; MAPS OF BOSTON SUBSEQUENT TO THE REVOLUTION. *The Editor* vii

ILLUSTRATIONS: Plan of Boston (*Gentleman's Magazine*) in 1775, *heliotype*, i; Nix's Mate in 1775, *heliotype*, i; Plan of Boston, 1775 (Pelham's), *heliotype*, iii; Plan of Boston (Page's), *heliotype*, iii; Boston Light in 1789, viii; Castle Island in 1789, ix.

AUTOGRAPHS: Henry Pelham, iii; James Urquhart, iii; Osgood Carleton, viii.

The Revolutionary Period.

CHAPTER I.

THE BEGINNING OF THE REVOLUTION. *Edward G. Porter* 1

ILLUSTRATIONS: James Otis, 6; Revenue Stamp, 12; Table of Stamps, 12; Lieut.-Governor Oliver's Oath, 15; Letter by James Otis, 20; Boston Harbor from Fort Hill, and Boston from Willis's Creek, *two heliotypes*, 23; Thomas Cushing, 34; Samuel Adams, 35; Josiah Quincy, Jr., 37; Extract from John Adams's brief, 38; Boston Massacre, 40; Andrew Oliver, 43; Revere's Engraving of Hancock, 46; John Adams's diary on the Tea-party, 50; Earl Percy, 58; Warren House, 59; General Warren, 60; Mrs. Warren, 63.

AUTOGRAPHS: Chas. Paxton, 4; James Otis, 6; Lord George Grenville, 8; Isaac Barré, 11; Earl of Bute, 13; "The Sons of Liberty," 13; Duke of Grafton, 21; Lord North, 26; Town's Committee (Thomas Cushing, Jonathan Mason, Edward Payne, Wm. Phillips, Joseph Waldo, Isaac Smith, Ebenezer

AUTOGRAPHS (*continued*):
Storer, Wm. Greenleaf), 29; General Knox, 32; Thomas Cushing, 34; Josiah Quincy, Jr., 37; Samuel Shaw, 38; Sampson S. Blowers, 38; Benj. Lynde, 38; letter signatures (James Bowdoin, Samuel Pemberton, Joseph Warren), 39; Andrew Oliver, 43; Peter Oliver, 43; William Cooper, town clerk, 44; Earl Percy, 58; Joseph Warren, 60; Adino Paddock, 62; Jedediah Preble, 64; Artemas Ward, 64; Earl of Chatham, 65; General John Thomas, 65; General William Heath, 65.

CHAPTER II.

THE SIEGE OF BOSTON. *Edward E. Hale* 67

ILLUSTRATIONS: Paul Revere, 69; Fac-simile of "A Circumstantial Account" (Apr. 19, 1775), 73; Gage's order, 76; Panorama from Beacon Hill in 1775, *heliotype*, 79; Mifflin's plan of the lines on Boston Neck, *heliotype*, 80; Colonel Trumbull's map of Boston and vicinity, *heliotype*, 80; British lines on Boston Neck, looking in and out, *two heliotypes*, 80; plan of the redoubt on Bunker Hill, 82; "General morning orders, June 17, 1775," fac-simile, 83; "On the field," fac-simile, 86; After the Battle, 88; General Knox, 95; General Howe's proclamation, 97; Washington at Dorchester Heights, 98; Major Judah Alden, 99; Washington medal, *heliotype*, 100.

AUTOGRAPHS: Paul Revere, 69; John Parker, 74; Timothy Ruggles, 77; Israel Putnam, 80; Admiral Samuel Graves, 81; General Wm. Howe, 81; General Henry Clinton, 81; General John Burgoyne, 81; Colonel William Prescott, 82; Colonel Richard Gridley, 82; John Brooks, 83; General R. Pigot, 85; Joseph Ward, 86; John Jeffries, 87; John Stark, 89; John Manly, 90; Judah Alden, 99.

SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES. *The Editor* 101

ILLUSTRATIONS: Plan of Lexington fight, 102; Wadsworth house, 107; Holmes house, 108; Artemas Ward, 109; Washington Elm, 110; Craigie house, 112; Elmwood, 114; Roxbury parsonage, 115; plan of Roxbury fort, 115.

AUTOGRAPHS: Richard Devens, 101; Peter Thacher, 103; James Barrett, 103; R. Derby, 103; John Sullivan, 104; Daniel Morgan, 104; Thomas Learned, 104; Alexander Scammell, 105; John Nixon, 105; Nathanael Greene, 105, 117; Charles Lee, 105; William Bond, 105; Ebenezer Bridge, 106; Ralph Inman, 106; Ephraim Doolittle, 107; Artemas Ward, 109; Benjamin Church, 111; William Eustis, 111; John Warren, 112; William Gamage, Jr., 112; Joseph Reed, 113; John Glover, 113 Andrew Craigie, 113; William Prescott, 115; John Greaton, 116; Thomas Chase, 116; Ebenezer Learned, 117.

CHAPTER III.

THE PULPIT, PRESS, AND LITERATURE OF THE REVOLUTION. *Delano A. Goddard* 119

ILLUSTRATIONS: Joseph Green, 132; *The Massachusetts Spy*, fac-simile, 135; *The Independent Chronicle*, fac-simile, 139; fac-simile of Warren's second Massacre Oration, 143.

AUTOGRAPHS: Samuel Mather, 127; John Mein, 131; Daniel Leonard, 133; R. T. Paine, 144; William Tudor, 144; Benjamin Church, Jr., 145; Phillis Wheatley, 147.

CHAPTER IV.

LIFE IN BOSTON IN THE REVOLUTIONARY PERIOD. *Horace E. Scudder* . . . 149

ILLUSTRATIONS: Liberty Tree, 159; *Peace-extra* (of 1783), 174.

AUTOGRAPHS: Boston merchants of the Revolutionary period (John Amory, Richard Salter, Timothy Fitch, Daniel Malcom, Alexander Hill, Richard Cary, Joshua Henshaw, John Scott, Samuel Eliot, Henry Lloyd, John Erving, Jr., Joshua Winslow, Samuel Hughes, Thomas Gray, Thomas Amory, J. Rowe, Jos. Green, Edward Payne, Nicholas Boylston, John Hancock, William Bowes, Ebenezer Storer, William Coffin, Sol. Davy, John Barrett, Nathaniel Greene, Thomas Russell, Jno. Sp oner, Joseph Lee, Joseph Sherburne, W. Phillips, John Avery, Isaac Winslow, Wm. Fisher, Benjamin Hallowell, Jona. Williams, Nathaniel Appleton, Daniel Hubbard, Jona. Mason, Henderson Inches, Nathaniel Cary, Harrison Gray, Jr.), 152, 153; John Lovell, 160; James Lovell, 160; French officers (Lauzun, Comte de Grasse, Barras, De Ternay, Comte de Rochambeau), 166; Lafayette, 173.

SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES. *The Editor* 175

ILLUSTRATIONS: Washington's proclamation, 181; Order to Captain Hopkins, 184; Bill for pine-tree flag, 188.

AUTOGRAPHS: William Tudor, 185; Baron Steuben, 185; Solomon Lovell, 185; Peleg Wadsworth, 186; Artemas Ward, 186.

The Last Hundred Years.

PART I.

CHAPTER I.

THE LAST FORTY YEARS OF TOWN GOVERNMENT. *Henry Cabot Lodge* . . . 189

ILLUSTRATIONS: John Adams, 192; James Bowdoin, 195; Washington, 198; Triumphal arch, 200; Hancock house, 202; Hamilton statue, 206; Gerrymander, 212; George Cabot, 214.

AUTOGRAPHS: George R. Minot, 191; B. Lincoln, 194; John Hancock, 201; Increase Sumner, 204; Moses Gill, 205; Caleb Strong, 205; James Sullivan, 208; Elbridge Gerry, 211; Massachusetts signers at Hartford Convention (George Cabot, Nathan Dane, H. G. Otis, Wm. Prescott, Timothy Bigelow, Joshua Thomas, Saml. S. Wilde, Joseph Lyman, Stephen Longfellow, Jr., Daniel Waldo, George Bliss, Hadijah Baylies), 213.

CHAPTER II.

BOSTON UNDER THE MAYORS. *James M. Bugbee* 217

ILLUSTRATIONS: John Phillips, 223; Josiah Quincy, 227; Quincy Market and Faneuil Hall, 228; Park Street, 232; Harrison Gray Otis, 235; Theodore Lyman, 237; Samuel A. Eliot, 244.

AUTOGRAPHS: H. G. Otis, 235; the mayors (John Phillips, Josiah Quincy, H. G. Otis, Theodore Lyman, Jr., Charles Wells, Samuel A. Eliot, Samuel T. Armstrong, Jonathan Chapman, M. Brimmer, Thomas A. Davis, Josiah Quincy, Jr., Benjamin Seaver, John P. Bigelow, J. V. C. Smith, Alexander H. Rice, F. W. Lincoln, Jr., J. M. Wightman, Otis Norcross, N. B. Shurtleff, William Gaston, Henry L. Pierce, Samuel C. Cobb, Frederick O. Prince), 290, 291.

CHAPTER III.

BOSTON AND THE COMMONWEALTH UNDER THE CITY CHARTER. *John D. Long* 293

CHAPTER IV.

BOSTON SOLDIERY IN WAR AND PEACE. *Francis W. Palfrey* 303

ILLUSTRATIONS: Thomas G. Stevenson, 317; William F. Bartlett, 318; Paul J. Revere, 319; Robert G. Shaw, 321; Wilder Dwight, 322; Henry L. Abbott, 323; Soldiers' Monument, 324.

CHAPTER V.

THE NAVY AND THE CHARLESTOWN NAVY YARD. *George Henry Preble* . . 331

ILLUSTRATIONS: Plan of Navy Yard as originally purchased, 337; Isaac Hull, 339; plan of Navy Yard (in 1823), 342; (in 1828), 350; (in 1874), 366.

AUTOGRAPHS: Commandants (Samuel Nicholson, Wm. Bainbridge, Isaac Hull, C. Morris, W. M. Crane, W. B. Shubrick, J. D. Elliot, John Downes, John B. Nicholson, Foxhall A. Parker, F. H. Gregory, S. H. Stringham, W. L. Hudson, J. B. Montgomery, E. G. Parrott, Chas. Steedman, John Rodgers, Wm. F. Spicer, E. T. Nichols, M. Haxtun, F. A. Parker, George M. Ransom), 352, 353.

CHAPTER VI.

THE ANTISLAVERY MOVEMENT IN BOSTON. *James Freeman Clarke* 369

ILLUSTRATIONS: William Lloyd Garrison, 373; Charles Sumner, 391; Theodore Parker, 394.

AUTOGRAPHS: Theodore Parker, 394; John A. Andrew, 400.

CHAPTER VII.

THE CONGREGATIONAL (TRINITARIAN) CHURCHES. *Increase N. Tarbox* . . . 401

ILLUSTRATIONS: Lyman Beecher, 408.

AUTOGRAPHS: Joseph Eckley, 406; J. Morse, 407; E. D. Griffin, 407; John Codman, 407; Wm. Jenks, 407; Lyman Beecher, 408; B. B. Wisner, 409; W. Adams, 409; Justin Edwards, 409; N. Adams, 410; J. S. C. Abbott, 410; Silas Aiken, 411; W. M. Rogers, 411; Samuel Green, 411; E. N. Kirk, 412; W. I. Budington, 412; J. B. Miles, 413.

CHAPTER VIII.

The Baptists in Boston. *Henry M. King* 421

Illustration: Samuel Stillman, 422.

CHAPTER IX.

The Methodist Episcopal Church. *Daniel Dorchester* 433

CHAPTER X.

The Episcopal Church. *Phillips Brooks* 447

Illustrations: Tremont Street (about 1800), 451; J. S. J. Gardiner, 453; Ruins of Trinity (in 1872), 457.

CHAPTER XI.

The Unitarians. *Andrew Preston Peabody* 467

Illustrations: James Freeman, 473; Joseph S. Buckminster, 475.

CHAPTER XII.

A Century of Universalism. *A. A. Miner* 483

Illustrations: John Murray, 486; First Universalist meeting-house, 489; Hosea Ballou, 493; Columbus Avenue Church, 501.

Autographs: John Murray, 486; Edward Mitchell, 490; Sebastian Streeter, 490; Abner Kneeland, 491; Edward Turner, 491; L. S. Everett, 491; Calvin Gardner, 491; J. S. Thompson, 491; E. H. Chapin, 492; Thomas F. King, 492; T. S. King, 492; Hosea Ballou, 493; Thomas Whittemore, 497; Paul Dean, 498; Walter Balfour, 499; H. Ballou, 2d, 502; J. G. Bartholomew, 502; Benj. Whittemore, 503; Lucius R. Paige, 503; Otis A. Skinner, 504; Thomas B. Thayer, 504; Sylvanus Cobb, 504.

CHAPTER XIII.

The New Jerusalem Church. *James Reed* 509

CHAPTER XIV.

The Roman Catholic Church. *William Byrne* 515

Illustrations: Cathedral of the Holy Cross, 516; Bishop Cheverus, 518; Mount Benedict, 522.

Autographs: John Thayer, 515; J. Carroll, 517; John Cheverus, 518; F. A. Matignon, 519; P. Byrne, 519; Benedict, Bishop Fenwick, 520; John B. Fitzpatrick, 526.

CHAPTER XV.

CHARLESTOWN IN THE LAST HUNDRED YEARS. *Henry H. Edes* 547

ILLUSTRATIONS: Richard Devens, 550; the Edes house, 553; Charlestown (in 1789), 554; Tufts's Map of Charlestown (in 1818), 568.

AUTOGRAPHS: Josiah Bartlett, 548; Nathaniel Gorham, 549; Richard Devens, 550; Walter Russell, 551; Samuel Swan, 551; Samuel Holbrook, 551; Phillips Payson, 551; John Kettell, 551; Samuel Devens, 551; David Dodge, 551; Charles Devens, 551; John Leach, 552; Robt. B. Edes, 552; Wm. J. Walker, 552; Josiah Wood, 552; Thomas Edes, Jr., 552; Samuel F. B. Morse, 553; Joseph Cordis, 554; Joseph Hurd, 554; Samuel Sewall, 554; Ebenezer Breed, 555; Nathan Tufts, 555; Nathaniel Austin, Jr., 555; Isaac Rand, 555; Aaron Putnam, 556; Samuel Dexter, Jr., 557; Timothy Trumball, 557; Franklin Dexter, 557; L. Baldwin, 557; M. Bridge, 557; Samuel Payson, 558; Benjamin Frothingham, 559; Jedediah Morse, 560; Wm. I. Budington, 561; Thomas Prentiss, 562; James Walker, 562; David Wood, Jr., 562; William Austin, 564; Thomas Russell, 564; Richard Frothingham, 566; Thomas B. Wyman, 566; Solomon Willard, 566; Timothy Walker, 567; Oliver Holden, 570.

CHAPTER XVI.

ROXBURY IN THE LAST HUNDRED YEARS. *Francis S. Drake* 571

ILLUSTRATIONS: Henry Dearborn, 574; Meeting-house Hill (in 1790), 577.

AUTOGRAPHS: H. Dearborn, 574; W. Eustis, 575.

CHAPTER XVII.

DORCHESTER IN THE LAST HUNDRED YEARS. *Samuel F. Barrows* 589

ILLUSTRATION: Thaddeus Mason Harris, 593.

CHAPTER XVIII.

BRIGHTON IN THE LAST HUNDRED YEARS. *Francis S. Drake* 601

ILLUSTRATION: The Winship mansion, 608.

CHAPTER XIX.

CHELSEA, REVERE, AND WINTHROP FROM THE CLOSE OF THE PROVINCIAL PERIOD. *Mellen Chamberlain* 611

CHAPTER XX.

THE PRESS AND LITERATURE OF THE LAST HUNDRED YEARS. *Charles A. Cummings* 617

ILLUSTRATIONS: Benjamin Russell, 619; George Ticknor, 661; Ticknor's library, 662; Prescott's library, 667; Edward Everett, 671; original draft of Longfellow's "Excelsior," fac-simile, 673; Verse from Lowell's "Courtin'," fac-simile, 674.

AUTOGRAPHS: Benj. Russell, 619; Nathan Hale, 628; Epes Sargent, 630; Joseph T. Buckingham, 631; Jeremy Belknap, 635; Willard Phillips, 639; J. Q. Adams, 642; Jared Sparks, 647; C. M. Sedgwick, 648; L. Maria Child, 648; Jacob Abbott, 649; Richard H. Dana, 650; Charles Sprague, 650; John Pierpont, 651; S. Margaret Fuller, 656; George Ticknor, 661; Samuel G. Howe, 664; George Bancroft, 665; W. H. Prescott, 666; Daniel Webster, 670; J. L. Motley, 670; Edward Everett, 671; J. R. Lowell, 674; Oliver Wendell Holmes, 674; John G. Whittier, 675; Nathaniel Hawthorne, 676; H. B. Stowe, 678; R. H. Dana, Jr., 679; G. S. Hillard, 679; Edward E. Hale, 680; E. P. Whipple, 681.

INDEX 683

INTRODUCTION.

Maps of the Revolutionary Period. In the Introduction to the second volume the Editor offered as full a list as he could make of the maps of Boston and its vicinity, belonging to the Provincial Period. He brought the enumeration down to a time when the struggle of the Revolution began to require a new issue of maps, and at this point he again takes up the list.

1774. *A Chart of the Coast of New England, from Beverly to Scituate Harbor, including the Ports of Boston and Salem. Engraved by J. Lodge.* This map appeared in the *London Magazine*, April, 1774 (10 × 7½ inches). In the upper left-hand corner is a *Plan of the Town of Boston* (5 × 3½ inches). There are but few names of interest on the plan. There is a copy in the Boston Athenæum. The same plate was used in the *American Atlas*, issued by Thomas Jefferys in 1776, and printed by Sayer and Bennett.

1774. *A Map of the most Inhabited Part of New England, by Thomas Jefferys, Nov.* 29, 1774 (37¾ × 40 inches). In one corner is a map of the town (8½ × 5½ inches), and also a chart of the harbor (8¾ × 5½ inches), "from an accurate survey." See *Mass. Hist. Soc. Proc.*, September, 1864. This map is contained in *The American Atlas, by the late Mr. Thomas Jefferys*, London, Sayer and Bennett, 1776, numbers 15 and 16. It was also re-engraved for a *Map of the most Inhabited Part of New England*, published without date, at Augsburg, by Tobias Conrad Lotter.

The map of the town seems to be based on the *London Magazine* map of the same date; is called *A New and Accurate Plan of the Town of Boston in New England*. Mr. A. O. Crane issued a fac-simile, Boston, 1875. See the map described under 1784.

1775. *A Plan of the Town and Chart of the Harbor of Boston, exhibiting a View of the Islands, Castle, Forts, and Entrances into the said Harbor.* Dated Feb. 1, 1775 (14 × 12 inches); includes Chelsea and Hingham, and gives soundings. It appeared in the *Gentleman's Magazine*, January, 1775. Cf. *Mass. Hist. Soc. Proc.*, May, 1860. It is given herewith in fac-simile. The view on the same page of heliotype is of Nix's Mate as it appeared at this time, — now only a shoal. This is a reduction of one of the Des Barres series of coast views.

1775. Battle of Bunker Hill. The earliest plan of the battle is a slight sketch, after information from Chaplain John Martin, drawn by Stiles in his Diary, and reproduced in *Historical Magazine*, June, 1868; where will also be found a rude plan, made by printers' rules, given in *Rivington's Gazette*, Aug. 3, 1775. This last is reproduced in Frothingham's *Siege of Boston*. Lieutenant Page[1] made an excellent plan, based on a survey

[1] Page was one of the royal engineers, and served as aid to Howe; was wounded; was in England on leave in January, 1776, when the *London Chronicle* spoke of him "as the only one

by Montresor, of the British Engineers, showing the laying-out of Charlestown. The successive positions of the British line are indicated on a smaller superposed sheet. This was issued in London in 1776, called *A Plan of the Action at Bunker's Hill on the 17th June, 1775, between His Majesty's Troops under the Command of Major-General Howe, and the Rebel Forces.* The same plate, with some changes, was dated April 12, 1793, and used in Stedman's *American War*. It was re-engraved, reduced, by D. Martin, substituting "American" for "Rebel," and "Breed's" for "Bunker's" in the title, with a few other changes in names, and issued by C. Smith in 1797, in *The American War from 1775 to 1783*. See Hunnewell's *Bibliography of Charlestown and Bunker Hill*, 1880, p. 18, where a heliotype is given. It was again re-engraved, much reduced (5¼ × 9 inches), for Dearborn's *Boston Notions*, 1848, p. 156; and soon after, full size, following the original of 1776, in Frothingham's *Siege of Boston*.[1] A map of Boston, showing also Charlestown and Bunker's Hill, — but called *Plan of the Battle on Bunker's Hill. Fought on the 17th of June, 1775. By an Officer on the spot. London, printed for R. Sayer and T. Bennett, . . . Nov. 27, 1775*, — has the text of Burgoyne's letter to Lord Stanley on the same sheet. It has been reproduced in F. Moore's *Ballad History of the Revolution*, part ii.

Henry de Berniere, of the Tenth Royal Infantry, made a map similar in scale to Page's, but not so accurate in the ground plan. It was called *Sketch of the Action on the Heights of Charlestown*, and having been first mentioned in the *Gleaner*, — a newspaper published at Wilkesbarre, Pa., by Charles Miner, — as found recently in an old drawer, it was engraved, in fac-simile, in the *Analectic Magazine*, Philadelphia, February, 1818; where it is stated to have been found in the captured baggage of a British officer, and to have been "copied by J. A. Chapman from an original sketch taken by Henry de Berniere, of the fourteenth regiment of infantry, now in the hands of J. Cist, Esq." General Dearborn commented on this plan in the *Portfolio*, March, 1818 (reprinted in *Historical Magazine*, June, 1868), with the same plan altered in red (19½ × 12¼ inches), which alterations were criticised by Governor Brooks in June, 1818. See *N. E. Hist. and Geneal. Reg.*, July, 1858. G. G. Smith worked on this rectified plan in producing his *Sketch of the Battle of Bunker Hill, by a British Officer* (12 × 19 inches), issued in Boston at the time of the completion of the monument in 1843.

Colonel Samuel Swett made a plan (18½ × 12½ inches), based on De Berniere's, which was published in his *History of the Battle of Bunker Hill*, and has been reproduced, full size, in Ellis's *Oration* in 1841; and reduced variously in Lossing's *Field-book of the Revolution*, in Ellis's *History*, and *Centennial History;* and in other places.

There are other plans in the English translation of Botta's *War of Independence*, in Ridpath's *United States*, and in other popular histories. A good eclectic map is given in Carrington's *Battles of the American Revolution*, ch. 15. A map of Charlestown and plan of the battle (16¾ × 14 inches), by James E. Stone, was published by Prang & Co. in 1875. Felton and Parker's large survey of Charlestown, 1848, is of use in identifying localities, being made on the same scale as Page's plan; and it helped Thomas W. Davis in making a *Plan showing the redoubt, breastwork, rail-fence, and grass protection*, which was published in the Bunker Hill Monument Association's *Proceedings*, 1876, of which a section is given in Dr. Hale's chapter.

1775. *A Plan of Boston, in New England, with its Environs;* made by Henry Pelham (and often signed by him) under permission of Ja: Urquhart, town major, Aug. 28, 1775. It shows the lines about the town and the harbor. It was printed in two sheets (together, 42½ × 28½ inches), and published in London, June 2, 1777, done in

now living of those who acted as *aides-de-camp* to General Howe, so great was the slaughter of officers that day. He particularly distinguished himself in the storming of the redoubt, for which he received General Howe's thanks." — *Mass. Hist. Soc. Proc.*, June, 1875, p. 56.

[1] Frothingham, it will be seen, was in error in supposing his to be the earliest American reproduction. See *Mass. Hist. Soc. Proc.*, June, 1875, where will be found his account of the maps and views of Charlestown before and after the battle.

From the Gentleman's Magazine, 1775.



Nix's Mate in 1775.

aquatinta by Francis Jukes. Dr. Belknap said of it in 1789: "I believe there is no more correct plan than Mr. Pelham's." — *Belknap Papers*, ii. 115. There is a copy in Harvard College Library, and a tracing made from this by George Lamb was given in the *Evacuation Memorial*, 1876. There are two copies in the Massachusetts Historical Society's Library; another is owned by Samuel S. Shaw, Esq. Frank Moore, in his *Diary of the American Revolution*, gives a reduced representation of it; and a small fac-simile will be found in S. A. Drake's *Old Landmarks of Middlesex*. A reduced fac-simile of it is also given herewith.



1775. *A Plan of the Town of Boston with the Intrenchments, etc., of His Majesty's Forces in* 1775, *from the observations of Lieut. Page, of His Majesty's Corps of Engineers, and from the plans of other gentlemen;* engraved and printed for William Faden, Oct. 1, 1777 (11¾ × 17½ inches). It is reproduced by Frothingham, in his *Siege of Boston*, and also in the present History. It gives the peninsula only, with a small bit of Charlestown, and according to Shurtleff it gives names to several streets, etc., different from Bonner's. There was a later edition, October, 1778. The original drawing of this plan is in the Faden collection in the Library of Congress.

1775. *Boston, its Environs and Harbour, with the Rebels' Works Raised against that Town in* 1775, *from the Observations of Lieut. Page, of His Majesty's Corps of Engineers, and from the Plans of Capt. Montresor;* scale, 2⅝ inches to the mile; extends from Point Alderton to Cambridge, and from Chelsea to Dorchester (33 × 18 inches): "engraved and published by William Faden, Oct. 1, 1778." There is a copy in the Massachusetts Historical Society's Library, book 572, No. 3, "Miscellaneous Maps." The original drawing is in the Faden Collection, Library of Congress.

1775. *A large chart of Boston Harbor, and the neighboring country, surveyed by Samuel Holland*[1] (42 × 30 inches and without title), dated Aug. 5, 1775. It takes in Nahant, Nantasket, and Cambridge. It was subsequently dated Dec. 1, 1781, with some changes, and with the fortifications of the siege marked in and explained in marginal references; and is included by Des Barres in the *Atlantic Neptune*, part iii. No. 6, 1780–83. A text, sometimes with this later issue, says it was composed from different surveys, but principally from that of George Callendar, 1769, late master of His Majesty's ship "Romney." Richard Frothingham's copy of this later plate was used in making the reproduction in Shurtleff's *Description of Boston*, 1870. The same plate was used in *Charts of the Coast and Harbors of New England, from Surveys taken by Samuel Holland, etc., for the use of the Royal Navy of Great Britain*. By J. F. W. Des Barres, 1781.

[1] Samuel Holland was Surveyor-general of the northern colonies, and, working down the coast from the north, he had completed his surveys as far south as Boston in 1773; and in 1775 he reported to Lord Dartmouth that he was ready to run the line between Massachusetts and New York. He adhered to the crown in the Revolutionary war, and died in Lower Canada in 1801. Sabine's *American Loyalists*, i. 537.

An outline map of Boston Harbor and Massachusetts Bay is contained in a series called *Charts of the Coast and Harbors of New England, by J. F. W. Des Barres, from Surveys by Samuel Holland and his Assistants, who have been employed on that service since the year* 1764.

1775. *Seat of War in New England by an American Volunteer, with the Marches of the several Corps sent by the Colonies towards Boston, with the attack on Bunker Hill.* London, Sayer and Bennett, Sept. 2, 1775. (18 × 15½ inches.) It extends from Lower New Hampshire to Narragansett Bay, and west to Leicester. It was reproduced in the *Centennial Graphic*, 1875.

On the same sheet are two marginal maps, — *Plan of Boston Harbor* (5½ × 6 inches); and *Plan of Boston and Charlestown*, — the latter showing pictorially the battle of Bunker Hill in progress, and the town burning, — (5½ × 12 inches). It seems to follow for Boston the *London Magazine* map, and is fac-similed in W. W. Wheildon's *New History of the Battle of Bunker Hill*, 1875; also in the accounts and memorials of the battle prepared by David Pulsifer, James M. Bugbee, and George A. Coolidge. It also very closely resembles the following: —

1775. *Plan of the Town of Boston, with the attack on Bunker's Hill, in the Peninsula of Charlestown, on June* 17, 1775. *J. Norman, Sc.* (11½ × 7 inches, folding.) The Charlestown peninsula represents the town burning, and the British troops advancing to attack the redoubt. This map appeared in *An impartial History of the War in America, Boston: Nathaniel Coverley and Robert Hodge*, MDCCLXXXI. vol. i.; and in the second (1782) Newcastle-upon-Tyne edition of a book, published in London, of a like title, the first English edition having appeared in 1779. See Henry Stevens's *Hist. Coll.*, i., No. 435.

1775. *Map of Boston and Charlestown, by An English Officer present at Bunker Hill.* London, Sayer and Bennett, Nov. 25, 1775. (14 × 14 inches.)

1775. *Boston and the Surrounding Country, and Posts of the American Troops, Sept.*, 1775, is the title of a sketch in Trumbull's *Autobiography*, showing the lines of circumvallation as drawn by himself. *Mass. Hist. Soc. Proc.*, April, 1879, p. 62. It is given in fac-simile, in Dr. Hale's chapter in the present volume.

1775. *Plan of Boston and its environs, showing the true situation of His Majesty's Army, and also those of the Rebels; drawn by an Engineer at Boston, Oct.*, 1775; published, March 12, 1776, by Andrew Dury; engraved by Jno. Lodge for the late Mr. Jefferys, geographer to the King. (25 × 17¾ inches.) In Charlestown it shows the "Redoubt taken from ye rebels by General Howe," with the British camp on Bunker Hill. It includes Governor's Island, and takes in the Cambridge and Roxbury lines. It bears this address: "To the public. The principal part of this plan was surveyed by Richard Williams, lieutenant at Boston, and sent over by the son of a nobleman to his father in town, by whose permission it is published. N. B. — The original has been compared with, and additions made from, several other curious drawings."

1775. *Map of Boston, Charlestown and vicinity*, showing the lines of circumvallation; in Force's *American Archives*, iii. and reproduced in W. W. Wheildon's *Siege and Evacuation of Boston and Charlestown*, 1876.

1775. *Plan of Boston*, with Charlestown marked as in ruins; in the *Gentleman's Magazine*, October 1775.

1775. *A new and correct plan of the Town of Boston and Provincial Camp* is in the *Pennsylvania Magazine*, July, 1775. It resembles that in the *Gentleman's Magazine*, January, 1775, and was engraved by Aitkins (7½ × 10½ inches), showing the peninsula only. In one corner of the plate is a plan of the Provincial Camp, scale two miles to one inch, with the circumvallating lines. It is reproduced in W. W. Wheildon's *Siege and Evacuation of Boston and Charlestown*; Moore's *Ballad History*, etc.

1775. *A new Plan of Boston Harbour from an actual survey*, C. Lownes, sculp.: in the *Pennsylvania Magazine*, June, 1775. (7½ × 10½ inches.) It has this legend: "N. B. — Charlestown burnt, June 17, 1775, by the Regulars."

A PLAN of
THE TOWN OF BOSTON
with
the INTRENCHMENTS &c.
OF
HIS MAJESTY'S FORCES in 1775
from the Observations of
LIEUT. PAGE
of His MAJESTY'S Corps of Engineers:
and from the Plans of other GENTLEMEN.
Engraved & Printed for W.m Faden, Charing Cross,
as the Act directs 1st March 1777
CHARLESTOWN
Hudson's Point
Thomas's Point
MILL POND
Long Wharf
South Battery
Hancock's Wharf
Faneuil Hall
Town House
Old Meeting
Province House
Kings Chapel
Work House
Old South Meeting
New South Meeting
Old Brick Meeting
Common
Boston Neck
all this Part is dry at Low Water
Dry at Low Water except in the Mid Channel
References to the Lines &c
References to the Town
Scale of Yards

1775. *To the Honl. Jno. Hancock, Esq., . . . this Map of the Seat of Civil War in America is . . . inscribed by . . . B. Romans.* It extends from Buzzard's Bay to Salem, from the ocean to Leicester. (15 × 17 inches.) It contains also a marginal *Plan of Boston and its Environs*, 1775 (3 × 3½ inches), showing the circumvallating lines. In the lower right-hand corner is a small view (1 × 6½ inches) of *The Lines thrown up on Boston Neck by the Ministerial Army.* The key reads: "1, Boston; 2, Mr. Hancock's house; 3, enemy's camp on M[r] [?] Hill; 4, block house; 5, guardhouses: 6, gate and draw-bridge; 7, Beacon Hill."

1775. An inaccurate map of Boston and environs (10¼ × 8¼ inches), made in June, 1775, and published, Aug. 28, 1775, in Almon's *Remembrancer*, i. It gives the head-quarters of the opposing forces, their camps, lines, etc. The second edition of the first volume of Almon contained a map giving forty miles about Boston, a plan of the town, and a map of the vicinity.

1775. A small *Map of Boston and Vicinity*, after one made during the British occupancy, is given in *Harper's Monthly*, June, 1873, in an article by B. J. Lossing, describing some views of Boston in the collection of Dr. Thomas Addis Emmet of New York.

1775. *Boston and circumjacent Country, showing present situation of the King's Troops, and the Rebel intrenchments.* July 25, 1775. (16¾ × 17 inches.) A fac-simile of this, from the original manuscript owned by Mr. Charles Deane, is given in the *Mass. Hist. Soc. Proc.*, April, 1879.

1775. *A draught of the Harbor of Boston, and the adjacent towns and roads*, 1775, is the inscription on a manuscript map (12 × 9 inches) in the *Belknap Papers*, i. 84, in the Massachusetts Historical Society's cabinet.

1775. *Plan of Dorchester Neck*, made for the use of the British Army, given in T. C. Simond's *History of South Boston*, p. 31. The *History of Dorchester*, p. 333, speaks of a map (of which an engraving is given) drawn by order of the British general, showing nine houses on the Neck, as being in the Massachusetts Historical Society Library; but it cannot now be found.

1775. *Boston and Vicinity*, following Pelham for the country and Page for the harbor (13 × 9½ inches), was compiled by Gordon for his *American Revolution*, in 1788.

1775. *Boston and Vicinity*, 1775-1776; engraved for Marshall's *Washington;* Philadelphia, C. P. Wayne, 1806. (8¾ × 13¼.) It follows Gordon's, and was reduced for subsequent editions. A wood-cut of a similar plan is given in Lossing's *Field-book of the Revolution*, i. 566. See also Carrington's *Battles of the American Revolution*, p. 154.

1775. *Map of Boston and Vicinity.* It is an eclectic map, showing the lines of circumvallation, and was engraved for Sparks's *Washington*, iii. 26, and is also given in the Boston *Evacuation Memorial*, 1876. It was followed in Guizot's *Washington*, and in Bryant and Gay's *United States*, iii. 427.

1775. *Boston and its Environs in* 1755 *and* 1776 (6¼ × 9 inches). Shows the harbor and the lines of circumvallation. An eclectic map, engraved for Frothingham's *Siege of Boston*, p. 91.

1775–1776. British Lines on Boston Neck. Several plans are preserved. The main defence was at Dover Street, the outer works being near the line of Canton Street. A manuscript plan, — "the courses, distances, etc., taken from the memorandum book of a deserter from the Welch Fusileers," — is preserved in the *Lee Papers*, belonging to the American Philosophical Society of Philadelphia, and of this a description is given in the *Mass. Hist. Soc. Proc.*, April, 1879, p. 62. A reduced fac-simile is given in Dr. Hale's chapter. It has an explanatory table of the armament in the hand of Colonel Mifflin, Washington's aid, and is signed T. M. A plan nearly duplicate, sent by Washington to Congress (Force's *American Archives*, fourth series, p. 29), is copied by Force (p. 31), and is reproduced in Wheildon's *Siege and Evacuation of Boston.* Cf. Trumbull's *Autobiography*, p. 22, where it is mentioned that Trumbull, an aid to General Spencer, who

had made a sketch of the works, by crawling up under cover of the tall grass, had hoped by this means to recommend himself to the Commander-in-Chief. "My further progress was rendered unnecessary," he adds, "by the desertion of one of the British artillerymen, who brought out with him a rude plan of the entire work. My drawing was also shown to the General; and their correspondence proved that, as far as I had gone, I was correct. This (probably) led to my future promotion." In the *Pennsylvania Magazine*, Aug. 1775, is an *Exact Plan of General Gage's Lines on Boston Neck in America.* (9 × 11½ inches.) The scale is a quarter of a mile to $4\frac{13}{16}$ inches. It gives both the outer and inner lines. In the text a statement is made of the guns mounted, ending, — "This is a true state this day, July 31, 1775." A drawing of the British lines on the Neck, dated August, 1775, is in the Faden collection of maps in the Library of Congress. An engraved view is given in heliotype in Dr. Hale's chapter. A somewhat rude delineation of the lines on a contemporary powder-horn is noted in *Mass. Hist. Soc. Proc.*, June, 1881.

1776. *Chart of Massachusetts Bay and Boston Harbor;* published, April 29, 1776; extends from Cape Ann to Cape Cod. It appeared in the *Atlantic Neptune*, dated Dec. 1, 1781. According to Shurtleff, one edition of this map is dated May, 1774. It also appeared, with the earlier date, in Des Barres' *Charts of the Coast and Harbors of New England*, 1781. W.P. Parrott in 1851 issued a reproduction of the Des Barres map of the harbor.

1776. *Chart of Boston Bay;* published Nov. 13, 1776. Takes in Salem, Scituate, and Watertown. (39 × 30½ inches.) The surveys were made by Samuel Holland. As appearing in the *Atlantic Neptune*, 1780–83, it is dated Dec. 1, 1781, and signed by J. F. W. Des Barres. It is also included in Des Barres' *Charts of the Coast and Harbors of New England*, 1781. The Back Bay is called "Charles Bay."

1776. There is in the Massachusetts Historical Society's Cabinet a rudely drawn map of the harbor and adjacent parts (8 × 7½ inches), in which the positions of the American forces are given. The Continental army is put at twenty thousand, and the Royal forces in the town at eight thousand.

1776. *The North American Pilot for New England, etc., from original surveys by Captain John Gascoigne, Joshua Fisher, Jacob Blamey, and other Officers and Pilots in His Majesty's Service.* London, Sayer and Bennett, 1776. This contains a chart of the harbor of Boston, with the soundings, etc. (34 × 21 inches). The course up the channel, from below Castle William, is marked by bringing the outer angle of the North Battery in range with "Charlestown tree," which stands on the peninsula, inscribed "Ruins of Charlestown." Harvard College Library has the volume, and the loose map is in the Massachusetts Historical Society Library, and in the Public Library. Cf. *Mass. Hist. Soc. Proc.*, Sept. 1864. A second edition, 1800, is also in the College Library, and has the same map.

1776. *Map of the seat of War in New England.* London: printed for Carrington Bowles, 1776. (6½ × 4½ inches.) It has on the margin a small chart of the harbor and environs.

1776. *The seat of the late War at Boston, in the State of Massachusetts* (7 × 10 inches), taking in Salem, Marshfield, and Worcester, is given in the *Universal Asylum and Columbian Magazine*, July, 1789.

1776. Plan of Boston in the *Geschichte der Kriege in und aus Europa*, Nuremberg, 1776.

1776. *Carte du port et havre de Boston, par le Chevalier de Beaurain*, Paris, 1776 (28 × 23 inches). It bears the earliest known representation of the Pine-tree banner, in the hands of a soldier, making part of the vignette. There are copies in the Massachusetts Historical Society Library, and in Harvard College Library.

1776. (?) There is in the collection of maps made in Paris for the State, by Ben Perley Poore, and preserved in the State archives, one entitled, *Carte de la Baye de Boston*,


PART OF
BOSTON
HARBOUR

située dans la Nouvelle Angleterre (7 × 6⅛ inches), which is marked, "Tome i. No. 30." as if belonging to a series.

1776. *Carte von dem Hafen und der stad Boston, mit den umliegenden Gegenden und den Lägern sowohl der Amerikaner als auch der Engländer, von dem Cheval de Beaurin, nach dem Pariser original von* 1776. Frentzel, sculpt. This also appeared in the first part of the *Geographische Belustigungen*, Leipsic, 1776, by J. C. Müller, of which there is a copy in Harvard College Library.

1778. The *Atlas Ameriquain Septentrional, à Paris, chez Le Rouge, ingenieur Géographe du Roi*, 1778, repeated the "Plan de Boston" from Jefferys' *American Atlas* of 1776, with names in English and descriptions in French. *Mass. Hist. Soc. Proc.*, September, 1864. There was also an edition "after the original by M. Le Rouge, Austin Street, 1777," styled *La Nouvelle Angleterre en 4 feuilles*.

1780. *Carte particulière du Havre de Boston, reduite de la carte anglaise de Des Barres, par ordre de M. de Sartine*, 1780 (23 × 34 inches). It has the seal of the "Dépôt générale de la marine," and makes part of the *Neptune Americo-Septentrional, publié par ordre du Roi*.

1780. *Plan of the new Streets in Charlestown, with the alteration of the old. Surveyed in* 1780 *by John Leach*. No scale given. (25¼ × 19¾ inches.) It shows parts of Main and Henley streets, the Square, and Water Street. The names of all abutters on the streets are given, with accurate measurements of each lot. It is manuscript.

1782. *A New and Accurate Chart of the Harbour of Boston in New England in North America* (6½ × 9 inches), published in the *Political Magazine*, November, 1827.

Maps of Boston Subsequent to the Revolution. — The following list gives all, or nearly all, the maps of Boston (including the harbor and the vicinity, and considerable portions of the town or present city) published between the close of the Revolution and the middle of the present century: —

1784. *Plan of the Town of Boston* (9 × 6 inches). This map is interesting as showing the outline of the "tri-mountain" in relation to the streets of 1784, when the original elevation had not been materially changed. It appeared in the *Boston Magazine*, October, 1784, accompanying a *Geographical Gazetteer of Massachusetts*, which was originally issued in instalments in that magazine. The original is in a copy of the magazine in the Boston Public Library. It was re-engraved in the New York edition (1846) of *A Short Narrative of the Horrid Massacre*, and in Kidder's *History of the Boston Massacre*, Albany, 1870. It resembles the *London Magazine* map of 1774.

1787. Dr. Belknap made a plan of so much of the town as was swept by the fire of April in this year, which spread along Orange Street, taking Hollis Street church, extending to Common Street. A fac-simile of his sketch is given in the *Belknap Papers*, i. 470.

1789. *Chart of the Coast of America, from Cape Cod to Cape Elizabeth. Sold by Matthew Clark, Boston, October*, 1789. It has a marginal chart of Boston Harbor (7 × 6 inches). This chart belongs to a collection of North American charts dedicated by Clark to John Hancock.

1789. A map of the town (9½ × 7 inches), engraved by John Norman (who had his printing office near the Boston Stone), which appeared in the *Boston Directory*[1] of this year, — the earliest one published. Dr. Belknap speaks of it as very imperfect. See *Belknap Papers*, ii. 115, and *Mass. Hist. Soc. Proc.*, June, 1875.

[1] This first *Boston Directory* was reprinted, correcting the alphabetizing, in Dearborn's *Boston Notions*; also in the *Directory* of 1852, and again separately in that year, from the same type. Copies of the first *Directory* usually want the map; the Public Library copy has it.

1791. *The American Pilot. Boston, John Norman*, 1791. O. Carleton,[1] Sept. 10, 1791, certifies on the title that he has compared the charts with Holland's and Des Barres', and other good authorities. A map of the coast from Timber Island, Maine, to New York, shows Boston Harbor (about 4 × 4 inches).

1794. Dr. Belknap sketched a plan of that part of the town lying between Washington Street and Fort Hill, showing the new Tontine Crescent. A fac-simile is given in the *Belknap Papers*, ii. 351.

1794. *The English Pilot, London, Mount & Davidson*, gives a large chart of the *Sea Coast of New England from Cape Cod to Casco Bay, lately Surveyed by Captain Henry Barnsley. Sold by W. & I. Mount & T. Page, London.* It gives a space of about three inches square to Boston Harbor. The *Pilot* also contains a large chart of the *Coast of New England from Staten Island to the Island of Breton, as it was actually surveyed by Captain Cyprian Southack. Sold by I. Mount, T. Page, & W. Mount, London.* This



BOSTON LIGHT, 1789.[2]

plate has a marginal *Plan of Boston* (11½ × 7 inches), which seems to be Southack's reduction of Bonner, made sixty years before, in 1733. See Vol. I. p. liv.

1794. Matthew Withington's *Map of Roxbury* is the earliest manuscript map of that part of the present city. See Drake's *Town of Roxbury*, p. 52. There are copies of this at the State House and in the city surveyor's office.

1794. *A Plan of Charlestown, surveyed in December*, 1794. . . . *By Saml. Thompson, surveyor. Scale*, 200 *rods to an inch*. (16½ × 10½ inches.) It is stated in the margin that there are 344 acres within the neck, and 3,940 without the neck: that White Island, at the east end of Malden Bridge, contains 16 acres; and that the whole acreage therefore

[1] Osgood Carleton was born at Haverhill in 1742, and died in 1816. He served in the Revolution; and after the war taught mathematics in Boston, and published various maps, — among others a map of the State, by order of the General Court, in 1801. *Mass. Hist. Soc. Proc.*, i. p. 141. He was an original member of the Massachusetts Society of the Cincinnati.

[2] This is a fac-simile of a plate in the *Massachusetts Magazine*, February, 1789.

is 4,300, which includes Mystic Pond (200 acres), and also all brooks, creeks, and roads in the town. The adjoining towns are shown by different colored lines. Only the county roads in Charlestown are marked, and the site of the meeting-house on Town Hill is indicated. This plan is now in the Secretary's office at the State House, and has never been reproduced.

1795. An original map of the town, surveyed by Osgood Carleton for the selectmen, is preserved in the city surveyor's office, Boston. *City Document*, No. 119, of 1879.

1795. Carleton's survey was used in a small map (14½ × 9 inches), which was engraved by Joseph Callender for the second *Boston Directory*, published by John West, 1796. This same date was kept on the map in the *Directories* of 1798 and 1800. In 1803 the date is omitted, and a few changes are made in the plate. In 1807 the map is entitled simply *Plan of Boston*, and the references are omitted.

1797. *An accurate Plan of the Town of Boston, and its vicinity. . . . Also, part of Charlestown and Cambridge, from the surveys of Samuel Thompson, Esq., and part of Roxbury and Dorchester from those of Mr. Whitherington* [sic] (*all which surveys*



CASTLE ISLAND, 1789.[1]

were taken by order of the General Court). *By Osgood Carleton, teacher of mathematics in Boston. I. Norman, Sc. Published as the act directs. May* 16, 1797. (37 × 40 inches.) See *Mass. Hist. Soc. Proc.*, 1880, p. 365. There is a heliotype of the Boston part of it reduced, in Vol. IV., following the Harvard College copy.

1800 *A new Plan of Boston, from actual surveys by Osgood Carleton, with corrections, additions, and improvements.* This is of the peninsula only (27 × 20 inches), and is seemingly a section of the 1797 map. It was reproduced in 1878 by G. B. Foster, in fac-simile, somewhat reduced.

1801. *Plan of East Boston;* in Sumner's *History of East Boston.*

1803. See 1795 (Directory map).

1806. *A new Plan of Boston, drawn from the best authorities, with the latest improvements, additions, and corrections. Boston, published and sold by W. Norman, Pleasant Street; sold also by William Pelham, No.* 59 *Cornhill.* This is the 1800 plan, with the plate lengthened to include South Boston, "taken from the actual surveys of Mr.

[1] This cut shows, in fac-simile, a plate of this fortification which appeared in the *Massachusetts Magazine*, May, 1789.

Withington" (35 × 19 inches). There are changes of ward-numbers and bounds. The lower part of the plate, below Dover Street, is re-engraved. There is a copy in the Boston Public Library.

1809. Directory map, published by Edward Cotton; engraved by Callender (15 × 9½ inches).

1814. A map showing houses and estates (28 × 36 inches), drawn by J G. Hales, engraved by T. Wightman. A fac-simile was issued by Alexander Williams in 1879.

1814. A plan "of the contemplated design of erecting perpetual tide-mills," engraved by Dearborn, on wood, dated February, 1814. A copy in the American Antiquarian Society's Library is indorsed by Isaiah Thomas, "Done by the new method of printing the colors, 1813." This plan is given in reduced heliotype in Mr. Stanwood's chapter in Vol. IV.

1817. *Chart of Boston Harbor*; surveyed by Alexander Wadsworth, by order of Commodore William Bainbridge; engraved by Allen & Gaw: published in Philadelphia by John Melish in 1819; scale, 1500 feet to one inch (42 × 36 inches). Scale, 1500 feet to one inch.

1818. *Plan of the Charlestown Peninsula. . . . From accurate survey by Peter Tufts, Jr., Esq. Engraved by Annin & Smith, Boston.* (21 × 17¼ inches). See Mr. Edes's chapter in this volume.

1819. *Boston and Vicinity* (31½ × 25 inches), by John G. Hales, engraved by Edward Gillingham. Some issues are dated 1820. To this year are ascribed two volumes of original plans of streets, lanes, and abutting houses, made by Hales for the selectmen, which are preserved in the city surveyor's department. See *City Document* No. 119, of 1879. Hales's engraved map was reissued, with revisions by Nathan Hale, in 1829 and 1833.

1821. Hales's *Survey of Boston and Vicinity* has a map of the Back Bay, showing the "Great Dam," or Mill Dam.

1821. Blunt's *New Chart of the New England Coast* has a marginal chart of Boston Harbor.

1824. *Plan of Boston* (4 × 6¼ inches), by Abel Bowen, shows the original water-line and parts of the out-wharf. In Snow's *History of Boston*; also in Bowen's *Picture of Boston*, 1828; and in Snow's *Geography of Boston*, 1830.

1824. *Plan of Boston* (22 × 22 inches), by William B. Annin and G. G Smith; re-issued frequently by Smith, and used in the municipal registers and school documents.

1826. *Boston and Vicinity* (6 × 3¾ inches), by A. Bowen; in Snow's *History of Boston*, 1826 and 1828: and in Bowen's *Picture of Boston*, 1828.

1828. *Plan of Boston* (14½ × 9 inches), by Hazen Morse; in *Boston Directory*, published by Hunt and Simpson, and then by Charles Simpson, Jr.; continued in use till 1839, with changes and additions.

1829. See 1819.

1830. *Plan of the Town of Charlestown, in the County of Middlesex . . . . made in August, 1830, under direction of the Selectmen, conformable to Resolves of the Legislature passed March 1, 1830; by John G. Hales, surveyor.* Scale, 100 rods to the inch. (26½ × 15½ inches.) The principal roads without the neck are laid down, and all the principal streets on the peninsula are shown. This is drawn in india ink and colors; is preserved in the office of the Secretary of the Commonwealth, and has never been reproduced.

1831. Mitchell's *United States* has a map of Boston and Vicinity (4½ × 3¼ inches).

1831. Surveys of Dorchester (with Milton) made by Edmund J. Baker; lithographed by Pendleton; scale, 3 miles to 1 inch (33 × 26 inches).

1832. *Town of Roxbury*, by J. G. Hales: scale, 100 rods to 1 inch (25 × 17½ inches); includes the present West Roxbury. It is reduced in F. S. Drake's *Town of Roxbury*.

1833. See 1819.

1835. *Plan of Boston* (4 × 2¾ inches), by Annin; peninsula only; in *Boston Almanac*.

1835. *Map of Boston* (21 × 21 inches); includes Charlestown and Lechmere Point; engraved by G. G. Smith.

1835. *Map of Boston* (31 × 22 inches); drawn by Alonzo Lewis; engraved by G. W. Boynton; published by the Bewick Company.

1836. *Map of Massachusetts*, from surveys ordered by the Legislature in 1830; has a marginal map of Boston (5⅝ × 4⅞ inches); published by Otis, Broaders, & Co.

1837. *Map of Boston* (5½ × 5 inches); engraved by Boynton for *Boston Almanac*; used in later years.

1837. *Chart of Boston Harbor*; surveyed by B. F. Perham; directed by commissioners (L. Baldwin, S. Thayer, and James Hayward) appointed March, 1835.

1837. *A Plan of South Boston*, old bridge to free bridge; surveyed and drawn by B. F. Perham, — L. Baldwin, S. Thayer, and J. Hayward, commissioners.

1837. *A Plan of South Boston, East Boston, and Charlestown*; surveyed and drawn by B. F. Perham, — L. Baldwin, S. Thayer, and J. Hayward, commissioners.

1837. A Plan of Cambridge Bridge, and Boston and Roxbury Milldam; was surveyed and drawn by B. F. Perham, under authority of L. Baldwin, S. Thayer, and J. Hayward, commissioners; and of the same date and authority one of Cambridgeport, East Cambridge, and Charlestown. [*No title.*]

1837. A Plan of Cambridgeport, East Cambridge, Charlestown, Chelsea, East Boston, and South Boston; drawn by B. F. Perham, under the authority of the commissioners, L. Baldwin, S. Thayer, and J. Hayward. [*No title.*]

1838. *Plan of Boston* (15 × 11 inches); in T. G. Bradford's *Illustrated Atlas of the United States*, Boston.

1838. *Plan of Boston* (15½ × 9½ inches), by Hazen Morse and J. W. Tuttle; in *Boston Directory*, 1839, and in later years.

1839. *Plan of Boston* (18 × 17 inches), showing Governor's and Castle islands; engraved by G. W. Boynton for Nathaniel Dearborn; issued with various dates, and published from 1860 to 1867, with alterations, by E. P. Dutton & Co. It is based on the 1835 map of Lewis.

1839. *A Plan of South Boston, showing the additional wharves since* 1835, *also harbor line recommended by Commissioners in* 1839; drawn by G. P. Worcester, — H. A. S. Dearborn, J. F. Baldwin, C. Eddy, commissioners.

1839. A plan of Charlestown, Chelsea, and East Boston, showing the harbor line: was drawn by G. P. Worcester under the authority of the commissioners, H. A. S. Dearborn, J. F. Baldwin, and C. Eddy. [*No title*].

1839. A plan of Cambridgeport, East Cambridge, and Charlestown, showing the harbor line; recommended by the commissioners, H. A. S. Dearborn, J. F. Baldwin, and C. Eddy. [*No title*].

1841. *Boston and Vicinity*, by Nathaniel Dearborn. It follows the large State map.

1842. *Boston and Vicinity* (4 × 4 inches); in Mitchell's *Traveller's Guide through the United States*; issued with later dates.

1842. *Map of Boston* (14 × 11½ inches); engraved by Boynton for Goodrich's *Pictorial Geography*.

1842. *Map of Boston*, including the Charlestown peninsula (15 × 12 inches); engraved by R. B. Davies for the Society for the Diffusion of Useful Knowledge, London.

1843. *Map of the City of Roxbury* (34 × 25 inches); surveyed in 1843 by Charles Whitney; published in 1849; scale, 1,320 feet to 1 inch.

1844. *Topographical Map of Massachusetts*, by Simeon Boyden, shows Boston Harbor, with considerable detail, on a size of about 5 × 5 inches.

1844. *Map of Boston* (11½ × 9 inches); peninsula only; in Dickinson's *Boston Almanac*.

1844. *Map of East Boston* (34 × 21 inches), by R. H. Eddy; drawn by John Noble, June, 1844.

1846. *Map of Boston*, including East and South Boston; engraved by G. G. Smith.

1846. *Mystic River;* J. Hayward, E. Lincoln, Jr., commissioners.

1846. *Charles River to the head of tide waters;* drawn by L. Briggs, Jr.,— J. Hayward, and E. Lincoln, commissioners.

1846. *Plan of part of the City and harbor, showing lines of high and low water;* by G. R. Baldwin.

1846. *South Bay;* J. Hayward, E. Lincoln, Jr., commissioners.

1847. *Boston Harbor and the Approaches;* from a trigonometrical survey, under the direction of A. D. Bache, by commissioners S. T. Lewis and E. Lincoln.

1847. *Plan of Boston;* an original manuscript plan, made by W. S. Whitwell for the water commissioners; in the city surveyor's department. See *City Document*, 1879, No. 119.

1847. *Chart of the Inner Harbor;* T. G. Cary, S. Borden, E. Lincoln, commissioners; A. D. Bache, superintendent United States coast-survey.

1848. *Plan of the City of Charlestown, made by order of the City Council from actual survey; by Felton & Parker, and Ebenr. Barker. Scale, 400 feet to an inch.* Lithographed by J. H. Bufford, Boston. (32½ × 25 inches.)

1848. *Map of Boston*, including South and East Boston, by N. Dearborn.

1848. In N. Dearborn's *Boston Notions*, and engraved by him, appeared these maps: 1. *Plan of Boston* (6 × 4¾) inches; 2. *Boston and Vicinity* (3 × 4 inches); 3. *Boston Harbor* (4¾ × 8 inches). These maps appeared in other of Dearborn's publications about Boston, *Guides*, etc.

1849. *Boston and Vicinity* (11 × 9½ inches); in *Boston Almanac*, and in Homans's *Sketches of Boston.*

1849. J. H. Goldthwait's *Railroad Map of New England* has a marginal map (2½ × 2½ inches) of Boston and vicinity.

1849. See Roxbury map of 1843.

1849. *Chelsea Creek, between East Boston and Chelsea. Exhibiting the circumscribing line to which wharves may be extended;* surveyed by J. Low and J. Noble, — S. T. Lewis, and E. Lincoln, Jr., commissioners.

1850. *Map of Boston* (11 × 9½ inches); engraved by Boynton for the *Boston Almanac.*

1850. *Map of Dorchester* (36 × 28 inches); surveys made by Elbridge Whiting for S. Dwight Eaton; lithographed by Tappan and Bradford.

1850. *Inner Harbor, showing commissioners' lines proposed by S. Greenleaf, J. Giles, and E. Lincoln, commissioners.*

1850. *South Bay;* S. Greenleaf, J. Giles, and E. Lincoln, commissioners.

After this date the maps are very numerous.



THE

MEMORIAL HISTORY OF BOSTON.

The Revolutionary Period.

CHAPTER I.

THE BEGINNING OF THE REVOLUTION.

BY THE REV. EDWARD G. PORTER,

Pastor of the Hancock Church, Lexington.

WHATEVER period we fix upon as the beginning of the American Revolution, we are sure to find some preceding event which, in a greater or less degree, might justly claim recognition on that account. It has generally been conceded that the war opened with the outbreak of hostilities on the morning of April 19, 1775; and that opinion will probably never be reversed. But as there were reformers before the Reformation, so there were many public acts in the Province deemed revolutionary before the memorable engagement on Lexington Common. Blood had been previously shed in a collision between the king's troops and American citizens in the streets of Boston. Remonstrances against the arbitrary measures of the British Government had repeatedly taken the shape of open and defiant resistance. The Congress of 1765 had issued a Declaration of Rights which, though accompanied by expressions of loyalty to the king, was a very pronounced step towards colonial union and independence. The utterances of Franklin, of Otis, and of Samuel Adams, and the favor with which they were received, clearly indicated the ardent aspirations of the people for political liberty. Every successive encroachment of the Crown was met by an immediate and determined protest. For years the public mind had been in a state of such chronic agitation that the peace was at any time liable to be disturbed by acts of violence.

It is greatly to the credit of the colonists, as British subjects, that the final rupture was so long in coming. They would certainly have been justified in the judgment of mankind had they precipitated rebellion in the

earlier stages of their oppression. When we remember what indignities had been heaped upon them ever since the abrogation of the charter in 1684; when we recall the sufferings to which they were subjected by the passage of the numerous navigation laws restricting their commerce and prostrating their industries; when we bear in mind that the affection, which for a century and a half the colonists sincerely cherished for the mother country, was never cordially reciprocated, — we are not surprised that a feeling of estrangement at last grew up among them. The wonder is that it did not assert itself long before. For, be it remembered, the spirit of freedom which took up arms in 1775 was not a sudden development nor an accidental discovery. The people had always had it. They brought it with them from the Old World, where, from the days of King John, it had been the birthright of the English race.[1]

And so the Revolution, when it came, was only the assertion of this old principle, — a fundamental principle with the colonists, and one which they had never surrendered. Under its guidance they had repeatedly engaged in acts which they considered lawful and patriotic, but which the officers of government condemned as refractory, rebellious, or treasonable. These public acts, extending through many years, constitute no unimportant part of our history, since they contributed largely to bring about the final issue, and, by their close relation to subsequent events, belong to the Revolutionary period.

The excitement in Boston during the winter of 1760–61, connected with the application of officers of the customs for writs of assistance in searching houses for contraband goods, must ever be regarded as one of the most important of the early movements foreshadowing the approaching conflict. To understand the bearing of this event, it is necessary to take a glance at the condition of political affairs at that time.

George III. had just come to the throne. Canada had been conquered from the French. England, flushed with victory, was yet oppressed with a heavy debt; and the attention of her ministers was turned to the system of colonial administration with a view to a large increase of the revenue. The Colonies came out of the war with many losses, to be sure, but trained and strengthened by hardship, encouraged by success, and eager to return to the pursuits of peace. The population was increasing; new and valuable lands were occupied; and business began to revive with extraordinary rapidity.

From this period we can distinctly trace the growth of two opposing political principles, both of which had existed in New England side by side from the very beginning with only an occasional clashing, but which now were destined to contend with each other in an irrepressible conflict.

[1] [The development of the spirit is more admirably traced than elsewhere in Richard Frothingham's *Rise of the Republic*. The inevitable outcome of independence was not faced seriously till quite late. For references in this matter see Winsor's *Handbook*, p. 102. — Ed.]

These principles found expression in the two parties long existing,[1] but which now began to draw apart more and more; namely, the party of freedom, and the party of prerogative, — the former insisting upon the right of self-government under the Crown, and the latter maintaining the authority of the Crown in the place of self-government. The question at issue was a radical one, and upon it turned the whole history of the country.

Without stopping to discuss the weakness of England's position, the want of statesmanship in her councils, and the strange infatuation with which she pursued her fatal policy, we cannot overlook certain acts of trade which at this time were enforced by the Court of Admiralty, and which were designed to make the enterprising commercial spirit of America tributary to Great Britain. Much of the mischief brought upon the Colonies can be traced to the Board of Trade, — a powerful organization devised originally by Charles II. and re-established by William III. to regulate the national and colonial commerce. Though only an advisory council, having no executive power, its influence with the king and ministry was such that its recommendations were usually adopted. Burke[2] speaks of this notable body as a kind of political "job, a sort of gently-ripening hot-house, where eight members of Parliament receive salaries of a thousand a year for a certain given time, in order to mature, at a proper season, a claim to two thousand." The Board was intended to make the Colonies "auxiliary to English trade. The Englishman in America was to be employed in making the fortune of the Englishman at home."[3]

At the time of which we are now speaking, a profitable though illicit trade had sprung up between the northern colonies and the West Indies. Instructions were sent to the colonial governors to put a stop to this trade. Francis Bernard, late Governor of New Jersey, and a well known friend of British authority, having succeeded Pownall as Governor of Massachusetts, informed the Legislature in a speech shortly after his arrival "that they derived blessings from their subjection to Great Britain." The Council, in a carefully worded reply, joined in acknowledging the "happiness of the times," but instead of recognizing their "subjection," they spoke only of their "relation" to Great Britain; and the House, weighing also its words, spoke of "the connection between the mother country and the provinces on the principles of filial obedience, protection, and justice."[4] An opportunity soon occurred to show that the difference in language between the Royal Governor and the General Court was a deep-seated difference of principle and of purpose.

For many years the custom-house officers had availed themselves of their position to accumulate large sums, especially from a misuse of forfeit-

[1] [They were exemplified in the long struggle for the maintenance of the first charter (see Mr. Deane's chapter in Vol. I.), and in the conflict over the royal governors' salaries subsequently (see Dr. Ellis's chapter in Vol. II). — Ed.]

[2] *Speech on the Economical Reform.*

[3] Palfrey, *History of New England*, vol. iv. p. 21.

[4] Barry, *Hist. of Mass.*, ii. 256; Bancroft, iv. 378; and Dr Ellis's chapter in Vol. II. of this History.

ures under the old Sugar Act of 1733. This practice, added to the official rigor and party spirit with which they enforced the commercial laws, led to a general and deep-seated feeling of antipathy towards them on the part of the merchants.[1] This antipathy was greatly aggravated by a decision in the Superior Court against the treasurer of the Province, and in support of the attitude of the officers of customs.[2]

In November, 1760, Charles Paxton,[3] who was the head of the customs in Boston, instructed a deputy in Salem to petition the Court for "writs of assistance," to enable them forcibly to enter dwelling-houses and warehouses in the execution of their duty. Exceptions were at once taken to this application, and a hearing was asked for by James Otis, an ardent young patriot, whose connection with this case forms one of the most brilliant chapters in our history. At the first agitation of the question he held the post of advocate-general for the Colony, but rather than act for the Crown he had resigned the position. "This is the opening scene of American resistance.[4] It began in New England, and made its first battle-ground in a court-room. A lawyer of Boston, with a tongue of flame and the inspiration of a seer, stepped forward to demonstrate that all arbitrary authority was unconstitutional and against the law."[5] The trial came on in February, 1761. Thomas Hutchinson, who had just succeeded Stephen Sewall as chief-justice, sat with his four associates, "with voluminous wigs, broad bands, and robes of scarlet cloth," in the crowded council chamber of the old Boston town house, "an imposing and elegant apartment, ornamented with two splendid full-length portraits of Charles II. and James II." The case was opened for the Crown by Jeremiah Gridley as the king's attorney, and the validity of writs of assistance was maintained by an appeal to statute law and to English practice. Oxenbridge Thacher calmly replied with much legal and technical ability, claiming that the rule in English courts was not applicable in this case to America. James Otis[6] now appeared for the inhabitants of Boston, and in an impassioned speech of over four hours in length he swayed both the court and the crowded audience with marvellous power. He said: —

[1] A petition was sent to the General Court at this time, charging the officers of the Crown with appropriating to their own use moneys belonging to the Province. This petition was signed by over fifty leading merchants, whose names may be found in Drake's *Hist. of Boston*, 657, *note*.

[2] Hutchinson, *Massachusetts Bay*, iii. 89–92; Minot, *Hist. of Mass.*, ii. 80–87; Barry, 262, 263.

[3] [There is a portrait of Paxton in the Mass. Hist. Society's gallery. One, supposed to be by Copley, is in the American Antiquarian Society at Worcester. It is not recognized by Perkins. — Ed.]

[4] John Adams to the Abbé Mably. *Works*, v. 492.

[5] Bancroft, iv. 414.

[6] This eloquent champion of liberty was a native of Barnstable, and a graduate of Harvard in 1743. He began the practice of law at Plymouth, but two years later removed to Boston, where he rose to distinction as an earnest advocate of his country's rights. His father, the elder Otis, was a distinguished politician and Speaker of the House, and a candidate for the vacant judgeship which Governor Bernard had given to Hutchinson. See Tudor's *Life of Otis*; Hutchinson, iii. 86, *et seq.*; Barry, pp. 258–259.

"I am determined, to my dying day, to oppose, with all the powers and faculties God has given me, all such instruments, of slavery on the one hand and villany on the other, as this writ of assistance is. . . . I argue in favor of British liberties at a time when we hear the greatest monarch upon earth declaring from his throne that he glories in the name of Briton, and that the privileges of his people are dearer to him than the most valuable prerogatives of the Crown. I oppose that kind of power the exercise of which, in former periods of English history, cost one King of England his head and another his throne."

Otis then proceeded to argue that while special writs might be legal, the present writ, being general, was illegal. Any one with this writ might be a tyrant. Again, he said, this writ was perpetual. There was to be no return, and whoever executed it was responsible to no one for his doings. He might reign secure in his petty tyranny, and spread terror and desolation around him. The writ was also unlimited. Officers might enter all houses at will, and command all to assist them; and even menial servants might enforce its provisions. He said: —

"Now the freedom of one's house is an essential branch of English liberty. A man's house is his castle; and while he is quiet, he is as well guarded as a prince. This writ, if declared legal, totally annihilates this privilege. Custom-house officers might enter our houses when they please, and we could not resist them. Upon bare suspicion they could exercise this wanton power. . . . Both reason and the Constitution are against this writ. The only authority that can be found for it is a law enacted in the zenith of arbitrary power, when, in the reign of Charles II., Star Chamber powers were pushed to extremity by some ignorant clerk of the exchequer. But even if the writ could be elsewhere found, it would still be illegal. All precedents are under the control of the principles of law. . . . No acts of Parliament can establish such a writ. Though it should be made in the very words of the petition it would be void, for every act against the Constitution is void." [1]

Notwithstanding this forcible argument, and the soul-stirring eloquence with which it was presented, it did not prevail. The older members of the

[1] It is greatly to be regretted that this celebrated speech, which, in the judgment of many, originated the party of Revolution in Massachusetts, was never committed to writing. For such fragments of it as we have we are indebted to a few notes taken at the time, and to some incidental allusions found in letters of Bernard and Hutchinson. John Adams, late in life, "after a lapse of fifty-seven years," wrote out, by request, as much as he could remember of the argument of the speech. See Minot, ii. 91–99; Tudor's *Life of Otis:* Bancroft, iv. 416, *note;* Correspondence of John Adams and Mrs. Warren in 5 *Mass. Hist. Coll.* iv. 340; *Essex Inst. Hist. Coll.* Aug. 1860; Adams's *Life and Works of John Adams*, i. 59, 81, 82; ii. 124, 523, 524. [The case can be studied from a contemporary point of view in the reports made by the Josiah Quincy of that day, of cases in the Massachusetts Superior Court, 1761–1772, which were published in 1865, edited by his great-grandson General Samuel M. Quincy, with an appendix on the writs of assistance by Horace Gray, the present Chief-Justice of the Commonwealth. The late Horace Binney of Philadelphia wrote of the book, at the time, to Miss E. S. Quincy: "I have now read the reports, and with great satisfaction. They had good law in Massachusetts in the days of your grandfather, as well as good lawyers and a good reporter. Mr. Gray's appendix is one of the most clear, accurate, and exhaustive expositions that I have read, and has brought me much better instruction than I had before. I rather think they were legal under the act of Parliament, but I cannot believe they were constitutional, either here or in England, except as anything an act of Parliament does is constitutional" — ED.]

court were favorably disposed; but they yielded to the solicitations of Hutchinson, who proposed to continue the cause to the next term, in order, meanwhile, to apply to England for definite instructions. In due time the



James Otis [1]

answer came, in support of his well known position; and the court, with the semblance of authority rather than law, decided that the writs of assistance should be granted whenever the revenue officers applied for them.[2]

[1] [This cut follows a painting by Blackburn, in 1755, now owned by Mrs. Henry Darwin Rogers, by whose permission it is here copied. Having been more than once before engraved (see A. B. Durand's in Tudor's *Life of Otis*; another by I. R. Smith; and a poor one in Loring's *Hundred Boston Orators*), it was admirably put on steel by Schlecht, in 1879, for Bryant and Gay's *United States*, iii. 332. There is a genealogy of the Otis family in *N. E. Hist. and Geneal. Reg.* iv. and v.; also see Freeman's *History of Cape Cod*. Otis at one time lived where the Adams Express Company's building on Court Street now is. No American has received a more splendid memorial than Crawford has bestowed on Otis in the statue in the chapel at Mount Auburn. See an estimate of Otis in Mr. Goddard's chapter in the present volume. — ED.]

[2] Hutchinson, iii. 96; Bancroft, iv. 418; Barry, p. 267.

But Thacher and Otis had not spoken in vain.[1] They had electrified the people, and scattered the seeds which soon germinated in a spirit of combined resistance against the encroachments of unlawful power. Among those attending the court was the youthful John Adams, who had just been admitted as a barrister, and whose soul was ready to receive the patriotic fire from the lips of Otis. "It was to Mr. Adams like the oath of Hamilcar administered to Hannibal. It is doubtful whether Otis himself, or any person of his auditory, perceived or imagined the consequences which were to flow from the principles developed in that argument."[2] Patriots were created by it on the spot, — men who awoke that day as from a sleep, and shook themselves for action. Every one felt that a crisis was approaching in the affairs of the Province, if indeed it had not already come.

In tracing the causes which led to the final independence of America, it is always to be borne in mind that independence, in the political sense of the word, was not what the colonists originally desired. They were proud of their position as British subjects; and not until their loyalty had endured a long series of shocks, did it occur to any one that a separation was either possible or desirable. This will explain the docility with which the people of New England submitted to gross abuses and high-handed political measures through a period of over thirty years without doing more than to assert their rights, and to seek peaceable means of redress. They loved the mother country, and rejoiced in her prosperity.[3] Her history, her greatness, her triumphs, were all theirs. Their literature, their laws, their social life, their religious faith, were all English. Most of the towns and counties in Massachusetts were named after those in England, showing the affection the colonists had for the country from which they came. The architecture of Boston houses was almost an exact reproduction of that which prevailed in London or Bristol. A relationship of blood, of affection, and of interest was maintained by the closest communication which that age afforded. Packets were continually plying between the two countries; personal and business correspondence was frequent; and, in ordinary times, this intimacy was not affected by the official character and conduct of those who represented British authority on these shores. If the exercise of that authority had not exceeded its just limits, it would certainly have been a long time before the colonists would have demanded or accepted anything like a political separation. They were not adventurers, seeking capital out of conflict, but peaceable, industrious, law-abiding citizens; asking only for equality with their fellow-subjects, and deliverance from special and unequal legislation. They knew their rights under the charter, and were resolved to maintain them; and in this they were simply true to the traditions of the Anglo-Saxon race

[1] [The lawyers engaged in this cause are characterized in the chapter in Vol. IV. by Mr. John T. Morse, Jr. — Ed.]

[2] C. F. Adams's *Life of John Adams*, i. 81.

[3] Greene, *Historical View of the American Revolution*, pp. 5, 6.

from which they sprang. Their lot was cast in troublous times, but the trouble was not of their fomenting. They never invoked revolution, but were driven to it at last against their will by the stern logic of events. One of these events has already been described; but properly speaking, the great struggle did not begin with the excitement attending the application for writs of assistance. That excitement did not affect the country at large, nor did it seriously disturb the loyalty of the people of Boston. It led to much discussion and speculation, but to no organized resistance.

The first direct occasion for the uprising in America was the attempt on the part of the British Government to raise a revenue from the Colonies without their consent and without a representation in Parliament. Upon this turned the whole controversy, which lasted more than ten years and terminated in the final appeal to arms.

After the Peace of Paris,[1] England took a position of undisputed supremacy among the great powers of Europe. Her political and diplomatic influence was greatly increased by her military successes and her new territorial acquisitions. But this pre-eminence was attended by an exhausted treasury, and the first important question for her statesmen to ask was, how to increase the revenue. The American colonies, it was known, were gaining rapidly in population and wealth. There was no doubt of their ability to furnish large sums to the Crown. The people were loyal, and would be likely to sustain further draughts upon their resources.

So reasoned Charles Townshend, first lord of trade and secretary for the colonies in the new ministry formed by the Earl of Bute. No sooner did Townshend take office than he was ready with his audacious scheme to ignore charters, precedents, laws, and honor; to abrogate the rights and privileges of colonial legislatures; and to give Parliament absolute authority to tax an unwilling people to whom the privilege of representation had never been granted.

Townshend's scheme, in the form in which he presented it, did not succeed; but shortly after, — in March, 1763, — Grenville, first lord of the admiralty, eager to advance the interests of British trade, brought in a bill "for the further improvement of his majesty's revenue of the customs," authorizing naval officers on the American coast to act as custom-house officers. This bill soon passed both Houses and became a law.[2]

Bute's ministry was of short duration. Grenville soon took his place, supported by Egremont and Halifax, and retaining Jenkinson as principal secretary of the treasury. This triumvirate ministry was so unpopular as to become a "general joke;"[3] and was called "the three Horatii," "the

[1] Signed in February, 1763.

[2] Bancroft, v., 92; Barry, ii. 278.

[3] Walpole to Mann, April 30, 1763. See Lord Mahon (Stanhope), *History of England*, xli.

Athanasian administration," a "sort of Cerberus," a "three-headed monster, quieted by being gorged with patronage and office." [1]

One of Grenville's earliest measures was a bill for enforcing the Navigation Acts, in which he met with no opposition from Parliament or the King. His next plan was to provide for the army in America by taxing the Colonies. Upon this matter he consulted the board of trade, to ascertain "in what mode least burdensome and most palatable to the Colonies they can contribute toward the support of the additional expense which must attend their civil and military establishment." [2] The head of the board of trade was now the young Earl of Shelburne, an Irish peer, who was beginning to have great influence in British councils. On many questions he was a follower of Pitt, and was naturally opposed to extending the authority of Parliament. His reply gave no encouragement to the ministry; yet they continued pursuing their favorite project, and did all in their power to create a public sentiment in its favor. Before any action was taken Egremont died, and Shelburne was succeeded by the Earl of Hillsborough. Grenville now renewed his exertions for the passage of a revenue bill; and at a meeting of the lords of the treasury — Grenville, North, and Hunter — in Downing Street, on the morning of September 22, a minute was adopted directing their secretary, Jenkinson, "to write to the commissioners of the stamp duties to prepare a draught of a bill to be presented to Parliament for extending the stamp duties to the Colonies." [3] In obedience to this order the famous Stamp Act was prepared, and subsequently presented to Parliament. Probably its origin is not due to any one man. Bute thought of it, Jenkinson elaborated it, North supported it, Grenville demanded it, and England accepted it. It has generally been called, and with good reason, Grenville's measure. Whatever of credit or of odium attaches to it must be given to him. He did not expect the favor of the Colonies, but he was anxious to secure support at home; and as there was some doubt of the bill's passing without an exciting debate, he did not press the matter at once. Hoping also, possibly, to conciliate the Colonies, he yielded to the urgent solicitations of some of their representatives [4] who maintained that the proposed stamp duty was "an internal tax," and therefore that it would be better to "wait till some sort of consent to it shall be given by the several assemblies, to prevent a tax of that nature from being levied without the consent of the Colonies." [5] And so, "out of tenderness to the Colonies," the bill was not brought in for a year.

Meanwhile the Administration succeeded in carrying a measure, April 5, 1764, imposing duties on various enumerated foreign commodities imported into America, and upon colonial products exported to any other

[1] Wilkes to Earl Temple, in *Grenville Papers*, ii. 81.

[2] Bancroft, v. 107.

[3] *Treasury Minutes*, Sept. 22, 1763; Jenkinson's Letter, Sept. 23, 1763; Bancroft, v. 151.

[4] Thomas Penn and William Allen, of Pennsylvania; and Richard Jackson, his own private secretary.

[5] *Grenville Correspondence*, ii. 393; *Massachusetts Gazette*, May 10, 1764; Bancroft, v. 183; Barry, p. 284; Fitzmaurice, *Life of William, Earl of Shelburne*, i. 318, 319.

place than Great Britain. A heavy duty was also laid upon molasses and sugar. To enforce the provisions of this bill, enlarged power was given to the vice-admiralty courts, and penalties under the act were made recoverable in these courts.[1]

The news of the passage of the Sugar Act stirred up an intense commotion in all the maritime towns of America; the merchants everywhere held meetings, adopted memorials to the assemblies, and sent protests to England. In Boston, James Otis prepared a *Statement of the Rights of the Colonies*, and Oxenbridge Thacher expressed similar views in a pamphlet entitled *Sentiments of a British-American*.[2] A committee — Otis, Cushing, Thacher, Gray, and Sheafe — was also appointed to correspond with the other Colonies; and circulars were sent out stating the dangers that menaced "their most essential rights," and desiring the "united assistance" of all to secure, if possible, a repeal of the obnoxious acts, and to "prevent a stamp act, or any other impositions and taxes, upon this and the other American provinces."[3]

The Legislature, which had been prorogued month after month by Governor Bernard, to impede its action, finally met in October. Letters were received from the agents in England, and an address to the King was prepared; but as it failed of acceptance with the Council, it gave place to a milder address to the House of Commons, stating the objections which had been urged against the Sugar Act, and praying for a further delay of the Stamp Act.[4]

With the year 1765 the long dreaded measure, which had come to be regarded as the very symbol of usurpation, came into effect. At the opening of Parliament in January, Grenville presented the American question as one of obedience to the authority of the kingdom; and shortly after, with the support of Townshend, Jenyns,[5] and others, he proposed a series of resolutions, fifty-five in number, embracing the details of the Stamp Act, — the essential feature being the requirement that all legal and business documents in the colonies should be written on printed or stamped paper, to be had only of the tax collectors. All offences under this act were to be tried in the admiralty courts, and the taxes were to be collected arbitrarily, without any trial by jury.

[1] Minot, ii. 155; Holmes, *Annals*, ii. 125, *et seq.*; Barry, ii. 286.

[2] Both published in Boston, June, 1764. The General Court sent a letter of instructions to Mr. Mauduit, the agent of Massachusetts in London, expressing the state of feeling. "If all the Colonies," says the letter, "are to be taxed at pleasure, without any representation in Parliament, what will there be to distinguish them, in point of liberty, from the subjects of the most absolute prince? Every charter-privilege may be taken from us by an appendix to a money bill, which, it seems, by the rules on the other side of the water, must not at any rate be petitioned against. To what purpose will opposition to any resolutions of the ministry be, if they are passed with such rapidity as to render it impossible for us to be acquainted with them before they have received the sanction of an act of Parliament? A people may be free and tolerably happy without a particular branch of trade; but without the privilege of assessing their own taxes, they can be neither." Minot, ii. 103–175; Bradford, i. 21, 22.

[3] Hutchinson, iii. 110; Minot, ii. 175.

[4] *Massachusetts Records; Journal House of Representatives*, 1764, p. 102.

[5] Bancroft, v. 231–234.

Grenville advocated his bill with many plausible arguments and explanations. He had evidently anticipated all the difficulties it would encounter in England, but he failed utterly to comprehend the situation it would create in America. As was expected, it passed in a full house, February 27, without serious opposition, obtaining a majority of five to one. Among those who spoke and voted against it the names of Jackson, Beckford, Conway, and Barré deserve especial mention, as they afterward received the thanks of the Province for their services.

Colonel Barré[1] will always be gratefully remembered by the American people in connection with this event. Townshend having said that the Colonies were planted by the care, nourished by the indulgence, and protected by the arms of England, Barré rose and said: —

> "*They planted by your care.*' No! your oppressions planted them in America. . . . *They nourished up by your indulgence.*' They grew by your neglect of them. . . . *They protected by your arms.*' They have nobly taken up arms in your defence. . . . And believe me, — remember I this day told you so, — the same spirit of freedom which actuated that people at first will accompany them still."[2]

"The sun of liberty is set," wrote Dr. Franklin to Mr. Thompson[3] the very night that the act was passed; "the Americans must light the lamps of industry and economy."

The news of the passage of the Stamp Act reached Boston in April, and produced immediate alarm and indignation throughout the province.[4] Massachusetts and Virginia — "the head and the heart of the Revolution" — were the first to denounce the act, and they were soon followed by New York and Pennsylvania and all the other colonies. The determination was everywhere expressed that the act should never be executed. Sober men resisted it, because they saw that it would block the wheels of trade, prevent exchanges of property, interfere with all industry, and undermine their liberties, which they were not prepared thus to surrender. The case would have been entirely different if the colonists had levied these stamp duties

[1] Isaac Barré was born, 1726, of a Huguenot family living in Ireland; graduated at Trinity College, Dublin; entered the army and served in the French war; was a warm friend of Wolfe,



and was wounded at Quebec. Through the influence of Lord Shelburne he entered Parliament in 1761, after the fall of Pitt's ministry. His speeches were spirited, and often aggressive and harsh. He denounced tyranny and corruption, and usually appealed to the moral sympathies of men. He had something of the vehement, fiery eloquence of Pitt, and was a debater to be feared. See article on "Colonel Barré and his Times," in *Macmillan's Magazine*, December, 1876. The town of Barre, in Massachusetts, which was first named for Hutchinson, was afterward named for Barré.

[2] [It was in his speech of Feb. 6, 1765, that Barré had called the opposing party in the colonies the "Sons of Liberty," and the name brought over was soon adopted by them. — Ed.]

[3] Afterward secretary of the Continental Congress.

[4] [The act was at once issued in a pamphlet by Edes and Gill, then keeping their press on the site of the present Adams Express Company's office, in Court Street. See Snow's *Boston*, p. 258. For the feelings engendered, see Warren's letter, in Frothingham's *Life of Warren;* and John Adams's *Works*, iii. 405. — Ed.]

upon themselves, through their own assemblies, as the American people have since freely done to meet the cost of war; or if they had been allowed a voice in the government which exercised this authority.

A STAMP.[1]

It was an important principle which they felt to be at stake, — a principle which had hitherto been maintained in their relations with the mother country, and which they could not now see violated without a distinct and determined resistance.

At this juncture the Legislature of Massachusetts, at the suggestion of Otis, proposed the calling of an American Congress, consisting of committees from each of the thirteen colonies, to meet at New York in October, "to consult together," and consider the matter of a "united representation to implore relief."

While the leaders of the people were thus taking counsel of one another in solemn deliberations as to the course to be pursued, the popular feeling against the act, and the officers appointed to execute it, ran high in Boston. An occasion soon occurred to show how the people felt upon this subject. The birthday of the Prince of Wales, in August, was kept as a holiday. Crowds assembled in the streets, shouting "Pitt[2] and liberty!" Andrew Oliver, brother-in-law of Hutchinson, having been appointed stamp distributer, it was proposed that he be hung in effigy; and two days later, August 14, the public saw suspended from the old elm known as Liberty Tree[3] a stuffed figure of the obnoxious official, together with a grotesque caricature of Bute.[4] This pageant had

STAMP-OFFICE,
Lincoln's-Inn, 1765.

A

TABLE

Of the Prices of Parchment and Paper for the Service of *America*.

Parchment.

Skins 18 Inch. by 13, at Four-pence
22 —— by 16, at Six-pence
26 —— by 20, at Eight-pence
25 —— by 23, at Ten-pence
30 —— by 20, at Thirteen-pence
} each.

Paper.

Horn at Seven-pence
Fools Cap at Nine-pence
D° with printed Notices for Indentures
Folio Post at One Shilling
Demy —— at Two Shillings
Medium —— at Three Shillings
Royal —— at Four Shillings
Super Royal at Six Shillings
} each Quire.

Paper for Printing

News.

Double Crown at 14 s.
Double Demy at 19 s.
} each Ream.

Almanacks.

Book —— Fools Cap at 6 s. 6 d
Pocket —— Folio Post at 20 s.
Sheet —— Demy at 13 s.
} each Ream

[1] [There are a number of these stamps in the cabinet of the Massachusetts Historical Society: but our engraving is cut from one lent by Dr. Samuel A. Green. The impression is on a blue soft paper, secured by a transverse bit of soft metal, with another square piece of paper bearing the royal monogram covering the metal on the reverse. The accompanying reduced *fac-simile* of a schedule of prices for stamps is from a copy of the *Broadside*, kindly loaned by Dr. Green. — ED.]

[2] A change had just taken place in the ministry, and Pitt had returned to office.

[3] [See the engraving in chapter iv. of the present volume, with *note*. This fourteenth of August became a memorable anniversary for the Sons of Liberty, who eight years later, 1773, celebrated it by a "festivity" on Roxbury Common. Drake, *Town of Roxbury*, p 266. — ED.]

[4] A large boot, designed to represent Lord Bute, with a head and horns upon it. Bute had been frequently burned in effigy in England in

been prepared by a party of Boston mechanics,[1] called Sons of Liberty, who, prompted by the intense feeling of the hour, devised this method of expressing it. Great excitement followed, and thousands assembled to view the spectacle. When the news reached Hutchinson he ordered the sheriff to remove the effigies; but nothing was done until evening, when they were taken down by those with whom the proceedings originated, and carried in procession, escorted by a great concourse of people, through the street, into the Old State House, and under the council chamber where Bernard,



[2]

Hutchinson, and their advisers were assembled. "Liberty, Property, and no Stamps!" was the shout which greeted the ears of those dignitaries. After repeated huzzas, the populace moved on to Kilby Street, where they destroyed a frame which the stamp distributer was said to be building for an office. Taking a portion of it, they proceeded to Fort Hill where Oliver lived, and burned the effigies in a bonfire before his house. Boston had

the guise of a jack-boot, — a pun upon his name as John, Earl of Bute. Bonfires of the jack-boot were repeated during several years both in England and America. Mahon (Stanhope), *History of England*, v. 25. [One of the most considerate of the English writers is Grahame, *History of the United States*, iv. 183. See Winsor's *Handbook*, p. 4, for other references. — Ed.]

[1] Benjamin Edes, printer; Thomas Crafts, painter; John Smith and Stephen Cleverly, braziers; John Avery, Jr., Thomas Chase, Henry Bass, and Henry Welles.

[2] [Subscription to a paper sent by the Order in Boston to the Sons of Liberty in New Hampshire, preserved in the *Belknap Papers*, iii., in the cabinet of the Massachusetts Historical Society. A silver punch-bowl, said to have been used by the Sons of Liberty, bought by William Mackay after the Revolution, and now owned by R. C. Mackay, was lately exhibited in the Old South Loan Collection. — Ed.]

rarely witnessed such a scene. No one knew what would come of it. Bernard and Hutchinson took refuge in the Castle. The next day a proclamation was issued by the Governor, offering one hundred pounds reward to be paid upon the conviction of any person concerned in this transaction ; [1] but no one cared to act as informant against such a strong current of popular feeling. A few days later, August 26, a mixed crowd collected near the Old State House, and proceeded to the house of the registrar of the admiralty, opposite the court house, and burned his public and private papers. They next plundered the house of the comptroller of customs, in Hanover Street, and then hurried to the mansion [2] of Lieut.-Governor Hutchinson, who had incurred the increasing dislike of the people in consequence of his subserviency to the Government, his greed of office, and his supposed influence in favor of the Stamp Act. Hutchinson and his family escaped; but the mob sacked his house and destroyed a large quantity of plate, pictures, clothing, books, and a valuable collection of manuscripts relating to the history of the colony.[3] This was a disgraceful proceeding, and would never have taken place but for the frenzy occasioned by the free use of liquor among the "roughs" who led on the mob.[4] A large public meeting was held the next morning in Faneuil Hall, and resolutions were passed strongly deprecating these lawless proceedings, and calling upon the selectmen to suppress such disorders in the future, and pledging the support of the inhabitants to preserve the peace.[5] That the leading Patriots had no sympathy whatever with this riotous outbreak is seen also in a letter written by Samuel Adams to Richard Jackson, the colonial agent in London, in which he denounced these proceedings as "high-handed outrages," of which the inhabitants, "within a few hours after the perpetration of the act, publicly declared their detestation. All was done the day following that could be expected from an orderly town, by whose influence a spirit

[1] Drake, *History of Boston*, p. 696.

[2] In Garden-court Street; taken down about 1830. See Introduction to Vol. II. p. xi.

[3] [Hutchinson, *Massachusetts Bay*, iii. 124; also see Introduction to Vol. I. of this History, p. xix. and Vol. II. p. 526; and Drake's *Landmarks*, p. 167. — Ed.]

[4] [See contemporary accounts in Josiah Quincy's Diary, *Mass. Hist. Soc. Proc.*, April, 1858; and Joshua Henshaw's letter, in *N. E. Hist. and Geneal. Reg.*, July, 1878, p 268. Among the papers in the Charity Building is a copy of a deposition tending to show that the authorities had warning of the riot. Ebenezer Simpson testified to the selectmen that, Aug. 26, 1765, being at Spectacle Island, he met a man-of-war's boat, and one of the men told him that there was to be a mob in Boston that night, with intent to pull down the Lieut.-Governor's house, and that their ship's crew was sent for. Among these papers is also a copy of a letter from Warren to the selectmen, dated July 3, 1766, relative to the riot of the year before. He says he came into Boston about eight o'clock in the evening and overtook a much greater number of men than was usual, not in one large body but in little companies of four or five persons; and that the report of the disturbance being actually begun had already, at that time, reached Roxbury.

These papers also contain, as illustrating this period: a report on the condition of the North Battery in 1765, and estimates for rebuilding it in 1768; a report to the Governor on the population of Boston in 1765; and depositions as to trouble with British officers in 1768. These papers should be calendared. — Ed.]

[5] [Drake's *Boston*, p. 701. There are on file in the city clerk's office various warning letters addressed to Benjamin Cudworth, deputy-sheriff, in a disguised hand; and also others to Stephen Greenleaf, sheriff, regarding Cudworth. They were read to the town, and pronounced "abusive." — Ed.]

was raised to oppose and suppress it. It is possible these matters may be represented to our disadvantage, and therefore we desire you will take all possible opportunities to set them in a proper light." [1]

Throughout the colonies the same spirit of determined opposition to the Stamp Act was everywhere seen. Many of the officers appointed to distribute the stamps were compelled by the "unconquerable rage of the people" to resign, Oliver among the rest. Towns and legislatures hastened to make their declaration of rights, following one another "like a chime of bells," and planting themselves firmly upon the British Constitution and their chartered liberties. In the Massachusetts Assembly a series of fourteen resolves, prepared by Samuel Adams, asserting the inherent and inalienable rights of the people, were particularly considered and passed in a full house.[2] These resolves met with great favor, and were extensively published and quoted throughout the country. On October 7 the first American Congress ever held, composed of delegates from the different colonies, met in New York to take into consideration their rights, privileges, and grievances.[4] After mature deliberation in which members from all parts of the country participated, resolutions were passed embodying the warmest sentiments of loyalty to the King and respect for "that august body, the Parliament," and setting forth, in plain but temperate language, the reasonable demands of America, — such as the right to trial by jury, in opposition to the recent extension of the admiralty jurisdiction; and the right to freedom from taxation except through the colonial assemblies. The Congress also sent an address to the King, a memorial to the House of Lords, and a petition to the House of Commons. Before adjourning, this Congress consummated a virtual union by which the colonies became, as the delegates prophetically expressed it, "a bundle of sticks which could neither be bent nor broken." [5]



OLIVER'S OATH.[3]

[1] Wells, *Life of Samuel Adams*, i. 63.

[2] Ibid., i. 74–77.

[3] [Mr. R. H. Dana, Jr., brought this oath to the attention of the Massachusetts Historical Society, in June, 1872, their *Proceedings* of that date showing a *fac-simile* of it; the present is somewhat reduced. — Ed.]

[4] [James Otis here showed his power of leadership. See Tudor's *Otis*; Bancroft, v.; Flanders's *Rutledge*; Ramsey's *South Carolina*. — Ed.]

[5] Bancroft, v. 346. [This congress was a response to the call of Massachusetts. Its proceedings are in *Almon's Tracts*. — Ed.]

In the mean time there had been further changes in the ministry, resulting in the elevation of the Rockingham Whigs to power. This announcement was received with great satisfaction, as it was understood that the new cabinet was more friendly to American claims. That this opinion had some foundation appears in the orders sent to the royal governors and to General Gage, commander of the forces at New York, only one week before the Stamp Act was to take effect, recommending "the utmost prudence and lenity," and advising a resort to "persuasive methods."[1]

When the first of November came, the people were prepared to prevent the execution of the odious act by refusing as one man to buy or use the stamps. In Boston they tolled the bells of the churches and fired minute-guns. Vessels in the harbor hung their flags at half-mast. "Liberty, Property, and no Stamps!" was the watchword passing everywhere from mouth to mouth. Effigies of Grenville and Huske[2] were suspended from Liberty Tree early in the morning, and in the afternoon were taken down and carried to the court house and to the North End, and then back to the gallows on the Neck, where they were hung for a short time, and afterward were cut down and torn to pieces. The crowd then quietly dispersed, and the night was entirely free from disturbance.[3]

As the Stamp Act had become a law, only stamped paper was legal; and as the people were firm in their determination not to use it, they were obliged to suspend business. The provincial courts were closed; marriages ceased; vessels were unmoored; and all commercial operations were paralyzed. Merchants in New York, Philadelphia, and Boston agreed not to import from England certain enumerated articles; and in general the people ceased using foreign luxuries, and turned their attention to domestic products. Frugality was the self-imposed order of the day, and it was not without its results.

In December a town-meeting was held in Boston, and a committee appointed to request of the Governor and Council that the courts might be opened.[4] At the opening of the Legislature in January, the House, in replying to the message of the Governor, demanded relief from the existing grievances. "The custom-houses are now open," they said, "and the people are permitted to transact their usual business. The courts of justice also must be opened, — opened immediately; and the law, the great rule of right, duly executed in every county in this province. This stopping of the course of justice is a grievance which this Court must inquire into. Justice must be fully administered without delay."[5] The Council laid this address upon the table; but, in an informal way, gave assurances that the courts

[1] *Massachusetts Gazette*, Feb. 6, 1766; *Debates in Parliament*, iv. 302–306.

[2] John Huske, a native of Portsmouth, N. H., who had removed to England and obtained a seat in the House of Commons, and taken a prominent part in favor of the Stamp Act.

[3] Drake, *Boston*, pp. 707, 708.

[4] This committee was composed of Samuel Adams, Thomas Cushing, John Hancock, Benjamin Kent, Samuel Sewall, John Rowe, Joshua Henshaw, and Arnold Welles; and they were authorized to employ Gridley, Otis, and John Adams as counsel. Diary of John Adams in *Works*, ii. 157, *et seq.*; Barry, p. 307.

[5] *Massachusetts Gazette*, Jan. 23, 1766; Hutchinson, iii. 143.

would be opened at the next term, and business allowed to be transacted as usual.

This bold attitude of the American people caused no little annoyance and anxiety to the Administration. The case was, moreover, complicated by the change of sentiment in England regarding the justice of the policy initiated by Grenville. The English people were not prepared to repudiate their own love of liberty, nor to force upon any of their fellow-subjects the measures of absolutism against which their own glorious history had been a standing protest. Especially were the commercial and manufacturing towns in England dissatisfied with this policy; for it had reacted most unfavorably upon them, interrupting trade, injuring credit, and creating much suffering and discontent. We are not surprised, therefore, to find that both sympathy and interest prompted the nation to urge the repeal of an act which was as hostile to their own welfare as to that of America.

Upon the reassembling of Parliament in January, 1766, the King, in his speech, stated that "matters of importance had happened in America, and orders had been issued for the support of lawful authority." [1] The Lords responded, as usual, in terms of deference and co-operation; but in the House of Commons, which was unusually full, a debate ensued such as perhaps had never been heard before within its walls. The venerable Pitt, after an absence of more than a year, had arrived in town that morning. Though in a very feeble condition, and suffering from the gout, he took his seat while the debate was in progress, and soon after rose and made his ever memorable speech, — a masterpiece of fiery eloquence in which he denounced the Stamp Act, and demanded its immediate repeal. He said: —

"It is now an act that has passed. I would speak with decency of every act of this House, but I must beg indulgence to speak of it with freedom. The subject of this debate is of greater importance than any that has ever engaged the attention of this House, — that subject only excepted when, nearly a century ago, it was a question whether you yourselves were to be bond or free. . . . On a question that may mortally wound the freedom of three millions of virtuous and brave subjects beyond the Atlantic Ocean, I cannot be silent."

He then proceeded to argue that as the colonies had never been really or virtually represented in Parliament, they could not be held "legally or constitutionally or reasonably subject to obedience to any money bill" of the kingdom. In replying to Grenville he said, a little later on: "The gentleman tells us America is obstinate; America is almost in open rebellion! I rejoice that America has resisted." Upon this the whole House started as if touched by an electric shock. Near the conclusion of his speech he said: —

"In a good cause, on a sound bottom, the force of this country can crush America to atoms. . . . But in such a cause your success would be hazardous. America, if she fell, would fall like the strong man; she would embrace the pillars of the State,

[1] *Massachusetts Gazette*, March 27, 1766.

and pull down the Constitution along with her. . . . Upon the whole I will beg leave to tell the House what is really my opinion. It is that the Stamp Act be repealed, absolutely, totally, and immediately; that the reason for the repeal be assigned, because it was founded on an erroneous principle. . . ." [1]

Thus spoke the Great Commoner; with what effect upon the minds of the House appeared in the current of sympathy which at once turned toward him, and which, a little later on, expressed itself in the famous repeal. Toward the last of the month the House resolved itself into a committee of the whole to consider petitions for the repeal, which had been presented by the merchants of London, Birmingham, Coventry, Bristol, Liverpool, Manchester, and other towns. The sittings of this committee were continued more than two weeks. Among others, Benjamin Franklin, then a colonial agent in London, was summoned to the bar of the House; and his minute examination concerning the feelings and wishes of the Colonies contributed more to his personal fame than any previous occurrence in his life; and it is doubtful whether he ever wrote or said anything abler than his admirable replies on this occasion. In all that he said he was prompt and pertinent, accurate and concise, wise and true. The House of Commons listened to him for ten days, and must have been as much astonished at his answers as the whole American people were delighted with them.[2]

The committee who had listened to this remarkable examination soon "reported that it was their opinion that the House be moved that leave be given to bring in a bill to repeal the Stamp Act."

The crisis came on the night of February 21, when every seat was occupied, and the galleries, lobbies, and stairs were crowded with eager spectators. The debate was opened by Conway, one of the ministry, and a warm friend of the Colonies. He was followed by Jenkinson, Burke, Grenville,

[1] Bancroft, v. 382–396; *Debates in Parliament*, iv. 285–298.

[2] As a specimen of Franklin's shrewdness, take a few of his answers: —

"*Question.* — Do you think it right that America should be protected by this country and pay no part of the expense?

"*Answer.* — That is not the case. The Colonies raised, clothed, and paid during the last war near twenty-five thousand men, and spent many millions.

"*Q.* — Were you not reimbursed by Parliament?

"*A.* — . . . Only a very small part of what we spent.

"*Q.* — Do you think the people of America would submit to pay the stamp duty if it was moderated?

"*A.* — No, never, unless compelled by force of arms.

"*Q.* — What was the temper of America toward Great Britain before the year 1763?

"*A.* — The best in the world. . . .

"*Q.* — And what is their temper now?

"*A.* — Oh, very much altered.

"*Q.* — Did you ever hear the authority of Parliament to make laws for America questioned till lately?

"*A.* — The authority of Parliament was allowed to be valid in all laws except such as should lay internal taxes. It was never disputed in laying duties to regulate commerce.

"*Q.* — If the Stamp Act should be repealed, and the Crown should make a requisition to the Colonies for a sum of money, would they grant it?

"*A.* — I believe they would.

"*Q.* — What used to be the pride of the Americans?

"*A.* — To indulge in the fashions and manufactures of Great Britain.

"*Q.* — What is now their pride?

"*A.* — To wear their old clothes over again till they can make new ones." — Bigelow, *Life of Franklin*, i. 467–510; Sparks, *Franklin*, pp. 298–300.

and Pitt. About half-past one in the morning the division took place, and Conway's bill of repeal was carried triumphantly by a vote of two hundred and seventy-five against one hundred and sixty-seven. Pitt and Conway were tumultuously applauded as they left the House, while Grenville [1] was greeted with hisses. The final debate on the repeal was still more decisive. In the Lords the bill was carried by a majority of thirty-four; and on the day following, March 17, it received the reluctant sanction of the King, who spoke of it as "a fatal compliance." London was delighted with the result; the church bells were rung merrily; ships displayed their colors; the streets were illuminated; and a public dinner was given by the friends of America. In Boston the news was received with every conceivable demonstration of joy.[2] Liberty Tree was decked with lanterns; bells and guns, flags and music, illuminations and fireworks, proclaimed in unmistakable language the gratitude and loyalty of the people.[3] New York voted statues to the King and to Pitt. Virginia voted a statue to the King, and South Carolina one to Pitt. Maryland passed a similar vote, and ordered a portrait of Lord Camden. Boston had previously voted letters of thanks to Barré and Conway, and requested their portraits for Faneuil Hall.[4]

In the outburst of joy at the repeal, the public mind had not considered the full meaning of the accompanying declaratory act [5] claiming for Parliament absolute power to bind America "in all cases whatsoever." This act was a fatal mistake, and a wanton blow at the well known American principle of local self-government; for it soon became evident that the object of Parliament was, after all, political subjugation. This was precisely the point upon which the colonists had taken their stand. It was not the mere pecuniary loss involved in the enforcement of the stamp tax that they were considering, — they were abundantly able to pay that, — but it was the underlying question of right; and if that were not conceded, it would soon be found

[1] Walpole, ii. 299, 300.

[2] [Speaker Cushing had enclosed, June 22, 1766, a letter of thanks to the king, and the *fac-simile* on the next page is from Otis's letter to Cushing on this vote of thanks. The original is in the Lee papers in the University of Virginia Library. The principal demonstrations took place May 19, 1766. An obelisk was erected on the Common and decked with lanterns; Hancock illuminated his house and discharged fireworks in front of it from a stage; and these were responded to by similar demonstrations by the Sons of Liberty at the workhouse. Views of the obelisk were engraved by Revere, and one of them is given much reduced in Drake's *Landmarks*, p. 359. The earliest rumor of a repeal had appeared in the *Massachusetts Gazette*, April 3, 1766, having come from Philadelphia two days before. See Thornton's *Pulpit of the Revolution*, p. 120, where is also Chauncy's discourse on the repeal. — ED.]

[3] [A paper by General Gage concerning the Stamp Act and the revolutionary proceedings in Boston, is printed in *Mass. Hist. Coll.* iv. 367. There is in the collection of Charles P. Greenough, Esq., of Boston (whose treasures have been very generously put at my disposal, and from which I have often drawn in this and the final volume), a letter from London merchants to those of Boston, offering congratulations and encouragement on account of the repeal of the Stamp Act. A similar letter from business correspondents was contributed to the *Mass. Hist. Soc. Proc.*, March, 1876, p. 260, by Mr. T. C. Amory. — ED.]

[4] This was done at a town-meeting held Sept. 18, 1765. The portraits arrived in due time, and were hung in Faneuil Hall; but what became of them afterward is not known. They are supposed to have been removed when the British army had control of the town. Drake, pp. 703, 704. [See supplementary notes to the next chapter in this volume. — ED.]

[5] 6 George III. c. xii.

that the repeal was only a nominal and a temporary relief. Leading Patriots saw in this much to excite alarm; but for the time being, and for the sake of harmony, they were willing to remain silent.[1]



No well defined sentiment of union had as yet taken possession of the public mind. Not until it became evident that there was no other way of maintaining their freedom, did any of the Colonies think of measures tending to united action. One of the first to anticipate this necessity was Jonathan Mayhew, the patriotic pastor of the West Church in Boston, who, writing to his friend Otis one Lord's Day morning in June, 1766, said: —

"You have heard of the communion of churches; while I was thinking of this in my bed, the great use and importance of a communion of colonies appeared to me in a strong light. Would it not be decorous for our Assembly to send circulars to all the rest, expressing a desire to cement union among ourselves? A good

[1] Wells, *Life of Samuel Adams*, i. 116–118.

foundation for this has been laid by the Congress at New York; never losing sight of it may be the means of perpetuating our liberties." [1]

The possibility of such a union seems to have occurred to at least one English statesman at this time; for in the same month in which the above words were penned we find Charles Townshend boldly advocating in the House of Commons a radical measure aimed not only to secure a revenue, but also to prevent any such accessions of strength as the Colonies might gain by combined action. No man in the ministry was better informed than Townshend upon American affairs. He knew the resources of the people; he anticipated their rapid development; and the scheme which he now promulgated was expressly devised to make the whole colonial power tributary to the Crown. Therefore he favored the abolition of all their charters; and the substitution of a government in which the local assemblies should be restrained, a general congress forbidden, and the royal governors, judges, and attorneys become independent of the people.[2]

Townshend soon had further opportunities for prosecuting his scheme; for in the reconstruction of the ministry, which took place in the month of July, he was selected as chancellor of the exchequer by the Duke of Grafton, in the strangely incongruous administration of Pitt, now created Earl of Chatham. Townshend was the leading spirit in the new government, and availed himself of every opportunity to urge the advantages of an American civil list. He had been, with Grenville, a firm advocate of the Stamp Act. He ridiculed the distinction between internal and external taxes. He insisted that America should share the heavy financial burden of England.[3] In the absence of Chatham, who was most of the time suffering from feeble health, he dictated to the ministry its colonial policy. "I would govern the Americans," said he, "as subjects of Great Britain; I would restrain their trade and their manufactures as subordinate to the mother country. These, our children, must not make themselves our allies in time of war and our rivals in peace." With such purposes the resolute and reckless chancellor pushed his way into favor with Parliament, ignoring the scruples of his associates and defying the opposition of his enemies, until he succeeded in carrying the famous Townshend revenue bill through both Houses, and obtained the royal assent. These acts levied a duty on glass, paper, painters' colors, and tea; established a board of customs at Boston for collecting the whole American revenue; and legalized writs of assistance. The revenue was to be at the disposition of the King, and was to be chiefly employed in the support of officers of the Crown, to secure their independence of the local legislatures. "The die is thrown!" cried the Patriots of

[1] Bradford, *Life of Mayhew*, 428, 429. [See also Mr. Goddard's chapter in the present volume. — Ed.]

[2] Bancroft, vi. 9, 10.

[3] Fitzmaurice, *Life of William, Earl of Shelburne*, iii. 37 *et seq.*

Boston when they received the news of the passage of Townshend's bill; "the Rubicon is passed. . . . We will form an immediate and universal combination to eat nothing, drink nothing, wear nothing, imported from Great Britain. . . . Our strength consists in union; let us above all be of one heart and one mind; let us call on our sister Colonies to join with us in asserting our rights."[1] Governor Bernard having refused a petition to summon the Legislature, a town-meeting was called Oct. 28, 1767; and the inhabitants voted neither to import nor to use certain articles of British production. A committee was appointed to obtain subscribers to such an agreement, and the resolutions were extensively circulated throughout the country. The newspapers took up the subject with great warmth, and aided in a very important degree the formation of public opinion at this critical period. Able writers contributed timely letters, among which those written by a "Farmer of Pennsylvania"[2] attained a very wide celebrity for their calm and vigorous treatment of the great constitutional questions of the day. The communications sent by the Massachusetts Legislature in January, 1768, to members of the Cabinet and to the provincial agent in London, contain the full argument respecting the claims of the colonies. These papers, as well as the petition to the king which accompanied them, and the circular-letter to the sister colonies which was issued shortly after, were all drafted by Samuel Adams, whose masterly grasp of the great political issues of the time attracted universal attention and gained a host of friends to the cause of liberty. The circular-letter just alluded to met with a very gratifying response from the other assemblies, and was a most efficient instrument in securing unity of purpose among the leaders of the people in all parts of the country. The publication of these important documents produced such an effect that the board of commissioners of the revenue immediately prepared a memorial to be sent to England, expressing apprehensions for their personal safety; complaining of the unwarrantable license of the American press,[3] of the non-importation league, and of New England town-meetings; and asking for assistance in the execution of the revenue laws; adding, that there was not a ship of war in the province, nor a company of soldiers nearer than New York.

This memorial, together with the reports of Bernard and Hutchinson, soon drew from Hillsborough, secretary for the colonies, an order sent to all the governors, bidding them use their influence with the assemblies to

[1] Barry, ii. 339.

[2] John Dickinson, afterward a member of the first Continental Congress. [To a letter of gratitude from Boston Dickinson returned a reply, which is preserved among the Charity Building papers, and is addressed "To the very respectable inhabitants of the town of Boston;" and expresses the "reverential gratitude" for the late letter received by him:—

PENNSYLVANIA, April 11, 1768.

The rank of the Town of Boston, the wisdom of her counsels, and the spirit of her conduct render, in my opinion, the approbation of her inhabitants inestimable. . . . Love of my country engaged me in that attempt to vindicate her rights and assert her interests, which your generosity has thought proper so highly to applaud. . . . Never, until my heart becomes insensible of all worldly things, will it become insensible of the unspeakable obligations which, as an American, I owe to the inhabitants of the Province of Massachusetts Bay, for the vigilance with which they have watched over, and the magnanimity with which they have maintained, the liberties of the British colonies on this continent. A FARMER.

— ED.]

[3] [See Mr. Goddard's chapter in this volume. — ED.]

take no notice of the "seditious" circular-letter, which was described as "of a most dangerous and factious tendency," calculated to inflame the minds of the people, to promote an illegal combination, and to excite open opposition to the authority of Parliament. The House of Representatives of Massachusetts was required, in His Majesty's name, to rescind their resolutions, and to "declare their disapprobation of the rash and hasty proceeding." In case of their refusal to comply, it was the King's pleasure that the Governor should immediately dissolve them.[1] At the same time General Gage, Commander-in-chief of the royal forces in America, was ordered to "strengthen the hands of the Government in the Province of the Massachusetts Bay, enforce a due obedience of the laws, and protect and support the civil magistrates and the officers of the Crown in the execution of their duty."[2] Further peremptory orders were sent to Gage, in June, to station a regiment permanently in Boston; and the admiralty was directed to send one frigate, two sloops, and two cutters to remain in Boston harbor; and Castle William was to be put in readiness for immediate use.[3]

For about a month previous to this the ship of war "Romney" had lain at anchor in the harbor, and her commander had occasioned much trouble by violently impressing New England seamen, and refusing to give them up, even when substitutes were offered. The excitement arising from this was increased by the seizure of the sloop "Liberty" (June 10, 1768), belonging to John Hancock, for an alleged false entry. The popular outbreak in consequence of these proceedings, though resulting in no serious injury, was magnified by the commissioners into an insurrection, and made the occasion of still further appeals for personal protection, by force of arms, in the discharge of their duties.[4] The citizens, in response to a call for a legal town-meeting to consider the matter, gathered in such numbers at Faneuil Hall that they were obliged to adjourn to the Old South Meeting-house, where, with Otis as moderator, an address to the Governor was unanimously voted, and a committee of twenty-one appointed to present it.[5] At an adjourned meeting the next day (June 15), Otis strongly recom-

[1] Hillsborough to Bernard, April 22, 1768.

[2] Hillsborough to Gage, April 23, 1768.

[3] [The annexed heliotypes follow originals made by the British engineers not far from this time, and issued with DesBarres's series of coast charts. One represents the harbor from Fort Hill; the other is a view of the town from Willis's Creek, in East Cambridge. — Ed.]

[4] [There is an account of this seizure in Drake's *Boston*, p. 736. See John Adams's *Works*, ii. 215. A prominent leader in the mob which endeavored to prevent the sloop from being towed under the guns of the "Romney" was a Boston tradesman, Daniel Malcolm, who had a year or two before some pretty sharp altercations with the revenue officers, accompanied with vigorous action, so that he was found out to be not an easy person to deal with. The papers relating to these affairs of his are preserved among the Lee papers, in the libraries of Harvard College and the University of Virginia. Malcolm died shortly after, and they show his gravestone to-day in the Copp's Hill burying-ground, with its praises of him as "an enemy of oppression and one of the foremost in opposing the revenue acts on America;" and upon it are seen the bullet marks of the British soldiers, who used it as a target during the siege. Shurtleff's *Description of Boston*, p. 209. — Ed.]

[5] [This presentation took place at the Governor's house, on Jamaica Pond, where they were treated with wine, "which highly pleased [Bernard says] that part of them which had not been used to an interview with me." — Ed.]

mended peaceable and orderly methods of obtaining redress, and deprecated in the strongest terms all acts of mob violence, hoping that the cause of their grievances would yet be removed; and added: "If not, and we are called on to defend our liberties and privileges, I hope and believe we shall, one and all, resist even unto blood; but I pray God Almighty that this may never so happen." [1]

The Governor disclaimed having any responsibility for the occurrences complained of, but promised to stop impressments. Meanwhile, Hillsborough's instructions to Massachusetts to rescind her non-importation resolutions arrived, and were communicated in a message from Bernard to the General Court. Otis took the floor in reply, and spoke for two hours with even more than his accustomed vehemence, showing that it would be impossible for this House to rescind a measure of the previous House which had been already executed. He spoke respectfully of the King, but arraigned the course of the ministry and the legislation of Parliament with great severity. The subject occupied the attention of the House for nine days, under the guidance of a special committee.[2] The Governor communicated the threat to dissolve the Assembly in case they refused to comply, and pressed them for a decision. A recess was requested for consultation, but it was refused. The question was then put, in secret session, whether the House would rescind the resolution "which gave birth to their circular-letter to the several houses of representatives and burgesses of the other colonies." The vote was taken *viva voce*, and stood ninety-two nays against seventeen yeas. The answer to the Governor, informing him of their decision, stated that they regarded the circular-letter moderate and innocent, respectful to Parliament, and dutiful to the King; that they entertained sentiments of reverence and affection for both; that they, as subjects, claimed the right of petition jointly and severally, of correspondence, and of a free assembly; and that the charge of treason was unjustly brought against them. The Governor, following his instructions, thereupon closed the session, and the next day dissolved the General Court by proclamation. Thus was taken away the right of free discussion vested in the time-honored representative Assembly of Massachusetts. It was an act of arbitrary power, destined to recoil heavily upon those who enforced it. The other Colonies felt that their liberties were invaded as well, and sent the most cordial assurances of their sympathy and support. In this we can clearly see a new impulse given to the sentiment of union as a necessary means of mutual security. As dangers thickened, the people stood more and more together, determined to assert and defend their constitutional rights against the unlawful aggressions of imperial power. It soon became evident that the Administration had resolved upon employing the strong arm of military power to sustain its authority in the "re-

[1] *Boston News-Letter*, June 16 and 23, 1768.

[2] This committee consisted of Thomas Cushing (speaker), Mr. Otis, Samuel Adams (clerk), John Hancock, Colonel Otis, Colonel Bowers, Mr. Spooner, Colonel Warren, and Mr. Saunders.

A View of the Harbour of Boston taken from Dorchester Hill.

fractory" Province. Preparations were making to transfer two regiments from Halifax to Boston, and it was soon after announced that two others were expected from Ireland. This naturally led to a great excitement, and a town-meeting was called to consider what "wise, constitutional, loyal, and salutary measures" could be taken in the emergency. The Governor was requested to give information in regard to the troops, and to convene the Legislature. Upon his refusal, a convention of all the towns was proposed, to be held in Faneuil Hall within two weeks; and it was recommended that all the inhabitants should be provided with firearms and suitable ammunition;[1] and a day of fasting and prayer was appointed and observed in accordance with the New England custom.

The convention met on September 22, and was composed of representatives of nearly every settlement in the province. The same officers were chosen for chairman and clerk that filled those positions in the late Assembly, and the Governor was petitioned to "cause an assembly to be immediately convened." He refused to receive the petition, and denounced the convention as illegal, advising the members to separate at once, or they would "repent their rashness." The convention did not follow his advice, but continued in session six days, and reaffirmed the former declarations made by the General Court concerning their charter rights. The proceedings throughout were calm and moderate. A respectful petition to the king was prepared, in which they wholly disclaimed the charge of a rebellious spirit. An address to the people was also adopted, recommending submission to legal authority and abstinence from all participation in acts of violence. This was the first of those independent popular assemblies which soon began to exercise political power in the colonies. The Patriot leaders were wise and sagacious men, who, in asserting their rights, knew well how to keep the law on their side. When the proceedings of this convention were submitted to the attorney-general, and to the solicitor-general of England, to ascertain if they were treasonable, both declared that they were not. "Look into the papers," said De Grey, "and see how well these Americans are versed in the crown law. I doubt whether they have been guilty of an overt act of treason, but I am sure they have come within a hair's breadth of it."[2]

No sooner had the convention adjourned than the fleet arrived in the harbor, bringing two regiments, with artillery, under command of Colonel Dalrymple.[3] In response to a requisition for quarters in the town the council, and afterwards the selectmen, adhering to the law, declined to act, stating that the barracks at Castle Island were provided for that purpose.

[1] Hutchinson, iii. app. i.; *Boston News-Letter*, postscript, Sept. 22, 1768.

[2] Bancroft, vi. 206.

[3] [The Patriots had prepared to fire the beacon above the town, and had placed a broken tar-barrel in the skillet. This was perhaps the only time in which the surrounding country came near being roused in this way. Governor Bernard was informed of the movement, and sent Sheriff Greenleaf to remove the combustibles. Frothingham, *Life of Warren*, p. 80. An excellent likeness of Greenleaf, by Smibert, is owned by Mrs. S. G. Bulfinch, of Cambridge. — Ed.]

On the first of October eight armed ships, with their tenders, approached the wharves, with cannon loaded and springs on the cables. The Fourteenth and Twenty-ninth regiments, and a part of the Fifty-ninth, with two field-pieces, landed at Long Wharf and marched with fixed bayonets, drums beating and colors flying, through the streets as far as the Common, where a portion of the troops encamped, the remainder being allowed by the Sons of Liberty, later in the day, to occupy Faneuil Hall.[1] We can easily imagine the surprise and indignation with which the people of Boston beheld this demonstration of authority. They keenly felt the insult offered to their loyalty, and though no open resistance was made it was soon apparent that such a state of things could only engender mutual hostility which might at any time break out in a disturbance of the peace. The odious terms "rebel" and "tyrant" were now spoken with increasing bitterness, and the lines were drawn more sharply than ever between Tory and Patriot. While Boston was thus in the hands of a hireling soldiery, her people waited anxiously for intelligence from abroad, hoping that their communications to the King and Parliament would meet with a favorable consideration;[2] but again they were doomed to disappointment. Changes had taken place in the cabinet, but there was no change in the purpose of the Government. Chatham had resigned; Shelburne was removed; and Lord North[3] had taken the place left vacant by the death of Townshend.[4] At the opening of Parliament, the King referred to Boston as being "in a state of disobedience to all law and government," and declared it to be his purpose "to defeat the mischievous designs of those turbulent and seditious persons" who had "but too successfully deluded numbers" of his subjects in America. An animated debate followed, in which it was said that the difficulties in governing Massachusetts were "insurmountable, unless its charter and laws should be so changed as to give the King the appointment of the council, and to the sheriffs the sole power of returning juries."

[1] [Paul Revere's plate, showing this landing, is given in Vol. II. p. 532. Mrs. Turrell says in her recollections, in *N. E. Hist. and Geneal. Reg.*, April, 1860, p. 150: "When the British troops came here they were lodged in a sugar-house in Brattle Square, which belonged to Mrs. Inman. I think there were three thousand of them. The officers lodged in the house of Madam Apthorp, in which I now live." But this paper is somewhat confused in other respects, if not in this. See John Adams's *Works*, ii. 213. — ED.]

[2] [There is in the Charity Building collection a draft of a letter from the selectmen, Nov. 12, 1768, to Pownall and De Berdt, as endorsed by William Cooper, "on the present deplorable condition of this town, . . . changed from a free city to an almost garrison state." — ED.]

[3] Lord North, eldest son of the Earl of Guilford, entered the cabinet at the age of thirty-five, and remained fifteen years, during the most critical period in English history. He was always a favorite of the king, and a recognized leader in the ministry. He never understood the character or claims of the American people, and consequently favored a mistaken policy towards them, to which he adhered throughout the war.



[4] At the early age of forty-one. Bancroft, in summing up the character of Townshend, aptly calls him "the most celebrated statesman who has left nothing but errors to account for his fame," vi. 99.

Burke defended the Colonies, and denounced as illegal and unconstitutional the order requiring the General Court to rescind their resolutions. Barrington accused the Americans as traitors, adding, "The troops have been sent thither to bring rioters to justice." Lord North defended the recent act of Parliament, and said that he would never think of repealing it until he should see America "prostrate at his feet."

"Depend upon it," said Hillsborough to one of the colonial agents, "Parliament will not suffer their authority to be trampled upon. We wish to avoid severities towards you; but if you refuse obedience to our laws the whole fleet and army of England shall enforce it."

The indictment against the Colonies was presented in sixty papers laid before Parliament. Both Houses declared that the proceedings of the Massachusetts Assembly, in opposing the revenue acts, were unconstitutional; that the circular-letter tended to create unlawful combinations; and that the Boston convention was proof of a design of setting up an independent authority; and both Houses proposed, under the provisions of an obsolete act of Henry VIII., to transport to England "for trial and condign punishment," in direct violation of trial by jury, the chief authors and instigators of the late disorders. In the famous debate of this session, Burke, Barré, Pownall, and Dowdeswell spoke eloquently in behalf of the Colonies; but the address and resolutions were carried by a large majority.

After being nearly a year without a Legislature, Massachusetts was again permitted by the Governor, in the name of the King, to send its representatives to a General Court convened, according to the charter, on the last Wednesday in May, 1769. The first business was a protest against the breach of their privileges, and a petition to the Governor to have the troops removed from Boston, as it was inconsistent with the Assembly's dignity and freedom to deliberate in the presence of an armed force. They declined to enter upon the business of supplies, or anything else except the consideration of their grievances. The Governor refused to grant their petition, alleging want of authority over His Majesty's forces; and after vainly waiting a fortnight for them to vote him his year's salary, he adjourned the Assembly to Cambridge, and informed them that he was about to repair to England to lay the state of the province before His Majesty. The Assembly thereupon passed a unanimous vote, one hundred and nine members being present, to petition the king "to remove Sir Francis Bernard[1] forever from this government."[2] It has always been believed that much of the difficulty between Massachusetts and Great Britain was owing to the total unfitness of Bernard for the important position which he held during nine eventful years. His frequent misrepresentations of the spirit and conduct of the colonists are a matter of record. He left no friends behind him. Indeed his departure was an occasion of public rejoicing. "The bells were rung, guns

[1] Bernard had recently received a baronetcy, "a most ill-timed favor, when he had so grievously failed in gaining the affections or the confidence of any order or rank of men within his province." Mahon, *History of England*, v. 241.

[2] *Journal*, House of Representatives, 1769, 36.

were fired from Mr. Hancock's wharf, Liberty Tree was covered with flags, and in the evening a great bonfire was made upon Fort Hill." [1]

Lieut.-Governor Hutchinson succeeded to the chair as chief magistrate. He was a native of Boston, was acquainted with public affairs, and for many years had held more important offices than any other man in the province; but his career had been so often marred by duplicity and avarice that very little hope was cherished of any improvement in the administration. His failure was in part owing to the difficulty he found in trying to serve both England and America, with a decided preference in favor of the former, at a time when the opinions and interests of the two countries were rapidly becoming distinct. He was not the man for the times.[2] When the Massachusetts Assembly, sitting at Cambridge, had refused to grant the supplies demanded by Bernard, that functionary prorogued it to the tenth of January. When that date arrived, Hutchinson, under arbitrary instructions from Hillsborough, prorogued it still further to the middle of March.

Meanwhile the non-importation agreements had become so general as to produce a visible effect upon British commerce. Exports from England to America had fallen off seriously, and English merchants were really injured more than the Americans by the narrow revenue policy of the Government. Lord North, perceiving this, caused a circular-letter to be sent to the Colonies, proposing to favor the removal of duties from all articles, except tea, enumerated in the late act. This was evidently a measure of expediency, dictated wholly by self-interest; and as by retaining the duty on tea there was no surrender of the obnoxious claim contained in the declaratory act, it did not materially affect the situation in America.

Boston at this time, in a legal town-meeting,[3] issued an *Appeal to the World*, prepared by Samuel Adams, vindicating itself from the aspersions of Bernard, Gage, Hood, and the revenue officers. The Appeal says: —

"We should yet be glad that the ancient and happy union between Great Britain and this country might be restored. The taking off the duties on paper, glass, and

[1] Hutchinson, iii. 254. [See Dr. Ellis's estimate of Bernard in Vol. II. of this History, p. 65. The Governor left his estate on Jamaica Pond, July 31, 1769, and embarked the next day from the Castle. Lady Bernard did not leave the estate till December, 1770. — Ed.]

[2] Hutchinson's *History of Massachusetts Bay* deserves honorable mention as a work of rare ability and candor, for which students of our history will always be grateful. [See Dr. Ellis's estimate of Hutchinson's administration in Vol. II. p 69; and that by Frothingham in his *Warren*, p. 107. — Ed.]

[3] [Cooper, the town clerk, issued the warrant for this meeting, Sept. 28, 1769, and the meeting was held, October 4. A contemporary account (in the Chalmers papers, ii. 37, in the *Sparks MSS.* in Harvard College Library) says that Cooper read the letters to the meeting, "and took a good deal of pains to make the Governor appear as ridiculous as possible, which generally occasioned a grin of applause." Not long before this, the Sons of Liberty had dined together, Aug. 14, 1769, at Dorchester, and there is a list of their names in *Mass. Hist. Soc. Proc.*, August, 1869. John Adams's *Works*, ii. 218.

William Cooper, who figures largely in the town's transactions at this time, was a son of the Rev. William Cooper, D.D., of the Brattle Street Church; was born Oct. 1, 1721, and died Nov. 28, 1809. He was first chosen town clerk in 1761, and held the office till his death. In 1755–56 he was a representative to the General Court. From 1759 to 1800 he was Register of Probate. He is buried in the Granary Burial-ground. He lived on Hanover Street. He married, April 26, 1745, Katharine, daughter of Jacob Wendell, and had sixteen children. See notices in *Boston Patriot*, Dec. 6, 1809, and *Evening Transcript*, July 7, 1881. — Ed.]

painters' colors, upon commercial principles only, will not give satisfaction. Discontent runs through the continent upon much higher principles. Our rights are invaded by the revenue acts; therefore, until they are ALL repealed, . . . and the troops recalled, . . . the cause of our just complaints cannot be removed."



SIGNATURES OF THE TOWN'S COMMITTEE.[1]

Society in Boston was thoroughly moved by the prevailing sentiment.[2] Three hundred wives subscribed to a league agreeing not to drink any tea

[1] [These autographs are from a letter sent by the town to Dennis De Berdt, the colony's agent in England, in order that through him "our friends in Parliament may be acquainted with the difficulties the trade labors by means of those acts." It recapitulates how the merchants and traders of Boston had entered into an agreement, August, 1768, not to import goods from Great Britain after Jan. 1, 1770, and had made a further agreement, Oct. 17, 1769, that no goods should be sent from here till the revenue acts be repealed; and how the other colonies had not gone to the same extent; and so they informed De Berdt that they had notified their correspondents to ship goods with the express condition that the act imposing duties on tea, glass, paper, and colors be totally repealed, and had forwarded to him papers with their views on the matter. The original is in a collection of a part of the papers of Arthur Lee, who succeeded De Berdt as the agent of Massachusetts, and thus retained many of the documents emanating from the province and from Boston during the early days of the controversy. The younger Richard Henry Lee, after writing the Lives of the elder of his name and of Arthur Lee, divided the manuscripts which had come to him among three institutions, — the Libraries of Harvard College, of the University of Virginia, and of the American Philosophical Society in Philadelphia. No recognizable principle of adaptation was followed in the division, sets being broken, — those now in Virginia containing many papers of the utmost interest for Boston history, and in some cases when others closely allied with them are in the Harvard College collection. The Editor has been kindly entrusted with these other collections by their respective guardians. Those in the College Library have been calendared in print under his direction. — ED.]

[2] [Richard Frothingham has minutely traced the progress of events and feelings of the people during this period, — from October, 1768, to the Massacre, — in his papers, "The Sam Adams

until the revenue act should be repealed. The young, unmarried women followed their example, and signed a document beginning as follows: "We, the daughters of those Patriots who have appeared . . . for the public interest, . . . do now with pleasure engage with them in denying ourselves the drinking of foreign tea." [1] . . . Even the children caught the spirit of patriotism, and imitated their elders in maintaining what they considered to be their "constitutional" rights.[2]

It was now nearly a year and a half since the troops had come to Boston, and their presence was a continual source of irritation to the inhabitants. Their services were not wanted; their parades were offensive; their bearing often insulting. Quarrels would occasionally arise between individual soldiers and citizens. "The troops greatly corrupt our morals," said Dr. Cooper, "and are in every sense an oppression. May Heaven soon deliver us from this great evil!" [3]

In this state of things, any unusual excitement might at any time occasion disastrous results. Towards the end of February an event occurred which threw the public mind into a ferment, and prepared the way for the tragic scenes of the fifth of March. A few of the merchants had rendered themselves unpopular by continuing to sell articles which had been proscribed. One of them in particular [4] had incurred such displeasure that his store was marked by the crowd with a wooden image as one to be shunned. One of his friends, a well known informer,[5] attempted to remove the image, but was driven back by the mob. Greatly exasperated, he fired a random shot among them and mortally wounded a young lad,[6] who died the following evening. The funeral was attended by five hundred children, walking in front of the bier; six of his school-mates held the pall, followed by thirteen hundred of the inhabitants. The bells of the town were tolled, and the whole community partook of the feeling of sadness and indignation that innocent blood had been shed in the streets of Boston.[7]

A few days later, a still more serious occurrence took place. On Friday, March 2, two soldiers, belonging to the Twenty-ninth Regiment, were passing Gray's rope-walk, near the present Pearl Street, and got into a quarrel with one of the workmen. Insults and threats were freely exchanged, and the soldiers then went off and found some of their comrades, who returned with them and challenged the ropemakers to a boxing-match. A fight

Regiments," in *Atlantic Monthly*, June, August, 1862, and November, 1863; matter which is only epitomized in his *Life of Warren*. John Mein, the printer, had refused to join in any non-importation agreement, and his name had been publicly proclaimed as one to be avoided in trade. He in turn printed the *State of the Importation of Great Britain with the Port of Boston from January to August*, 1768, and showed some of his detractors in the light of importers. See Henry Stevens's *Historical Collections*, i. No. 393. — ED.]

[1] *Boston Gazette*, Feb. 12, 1770, *et seq.*; Lossing, *Field-Book*, i. 488.

[2] Lossing, "1776," p. 90.

[3] Rev. S. Cooper to Governor Thomas Pownall, Jan. 1, 1770.

[4] Theophilus Lillie.

[5] Ebenezer Richardson, who lived near by.

[6] Christopher Snider.

[7] *Evening Post*, Feb. 26, 1770. [See Hutchinson; Gordon, i. 276; John Adams's *Works*, ii. 227. — ED.]

ensued, in which sticks and cutlasses were freely used. Several were wounded on both sides, but none were killed. The proprietor and others interposed, and prevented further disturbance.[1] The next day it was reported that the fight would be resumed on Monday. Colonel Carr, commander of the Twenty-ninth, complained to the Governor of the conduct of the rope-makers. Hutchinson laid the matter before the council, some of whom freely expressed the opinion that the only way to prevent such collisions was to withdraw the troops to the Castle; but no precautionary measures were taken. At an early hour on Monday evening, March 5, numerous parties of men and boys were strolling through the streets, and whenever they met any of the soldiers a sharp altercation took place. The ground was frozen and covered with a slight fall of snow, and a young moon shed its mild light upon the scene. Small bands of soldiers were seen passing between the main guard[2] and Murray's barracks in Brattle Street, armed with clubs and cutlasses. They were met by a crowd of citizens carrying canes and sticks. Taunts and insults soon led to blows. Some of the soldiers levelled their firelocks, and threatened to "make a lane" through the crowd. Just then an officer[3] on his way to the barracks, finding the passage obstructed by the affray, ordered the men into the yard and had the gate shut. The alarm-bell, however, had called out the people from their homes, and many came down towards King Street, supposing there was a fire there. When the occasion of the disturbance was known, the well disposed among them advised the crowd to return home; but others shouted: "To the main guard! To the main guard! That's the nest!" Upon this they moved off towards King Street, some going up Cornhill, some through Wilson's Lane, and others through Royal Exchange Lane. Shortly after nine o'clock an excited party approached the Custom House, which stood on the north side of King Street, at the lower corner of Exchange Lane, where a sentinel was standing at his post. "There's the soldier who knocked me down!" said a boy whom the sentinel, a few minutes before, had hit with the but-end of his musket. "Kill him! Knock him down!" cried several voices. The sentinel retreated up the steps and loaded his gun. "The lobster is going to fire," exclaimed a boy who stood by. "If you fire you must die for it," said Henry Knox,[4] who was passing.

[1] [See Drake, *Landmarks*, 274. It was men of the Fourteenth Regiment who were engaged in this affair, and their barracks were in the modern Atkinson Street. — Ed.]

[2] The "main guard" was located at the head of King Street, directly opposite the south door of the Town House. The soldiers detailed for daily guard-duty met here for assignment to their several posts.

[3] Captain Goldfinch.

[4] Afterward general, and secretary of war. [Knox was of Scotch-Presbyterian stock from the north of Ireland, and his family belonged to the parish of Moorhead, the pastor of the Long Lane meeting-house. His father, William, a shipmaster, had married Mary, a daughter of Robert Campbell; and Henry was their seventh son, and was born in 1750, in a house which Drake, *Life of Henry Knox*, p. 9, depicts, and says was standing, in 1873, on Sea Street, opposite the head of Drake's wharf. Losing his father in 1762, Henry went into the employ of Wharton & Bowes, who had succeeded the year before to the stand of Daniel Henchman, on the south corner of State and Washington streets. Knox was in this employ when the massacre occurred; but the next year (1771) he started business on his own account on the same street, about where

"I don't care," replied the sentry; "if they touch me, I'll fire." While he was saying this, snowballs and other missiles were thrown at him, whereupon he levelled his gun, warned the crowd to keep off, and then shouted to the main guard across the street, at the top of his voice, for help. A sergeant, with a file of seven men, was sent over at once, through the crowd, to protect him. The sentinel then came down the steps and fell in with the file, when the order was given to prime and load. Captain Thomas Preston of the Twenty-ninth soon joined his men, making the whole number in arms ten.[1] About fifty or sixty people had now gathered before the Custom House. When they saw the soldiers loading, some of them stepped forward, shouting, whistling, and daring them to fire. "You are cowardly rascals," they said; "lay aside your guns and we are ready for you." "Are the soldiers loaded?" inquired a bystander. "Yes," answered the Captain, "with powder and ball." "Are they going to fire on the inhabitants?" asked another. "They cannot," said the Captain, "without my orders." "For God's sake," said Knox, seizing Preston by the coat, "take your men back again. If they fire, your life must answer for the consequences." "I know what I'm about," said he, hastily; and then, seeing his men pressing the people with their bayonets, while clubs were being freely used, he rushed in among them. The confusion was now so great, some calling out, "Fire, fire if you dare!" and others, "Why don't you fire?" that no one could tell whether Captain Preston ordered the men to fire or not; but with or without orders, and certainly without any legal warning, seven of the soldiers, one after another, fired upon the citizens, three of whom were killed outright: Crispus Attucks,[2] Samuel Gray, and James Caldwell; and two others, Samuel Maverick[3] and Patrick Carr, died soon after from their wounds. Six others were badly wounded. It is not known that any of the eleven took part in the disturbance except Attucks, who had been a conspicuous leader of the mob.

When the firing began the people instinctively fell back, but soon after returned for the killed and wounded. Captain Preston restrained his

the *Globe* newspaper now is, calling his establishment the "London Bookstore." At least one book, *Cadogan on the Gout*, bears his imprint, 1772, and at the end of it is a list of medical and other books which he had imported. *Brinley Catalogue*, No. 1585. See H. G. Otis's letter in *N. E. Hist. and Geneal. Reg.*, July, 1876, p. 362. In November, 1774, Knox writes to Long-



man in London: "The magazines and new publications concerning the American dispute are the only things which I desire you to send at present." It will be remembered that Knox but six months before this had married a daughter of the royalist secretary of the province, Thomas Flucker, who had vainly tried to prevent the union; and a year from the day of their marriage Knox had slipped out of Boston clandestinely, to avoid interception by Gage, while his wife concealed in her quilted skirts the sword her husband was afterwards to make honorable. — ED.]

[1] Some accounts say eight.

[2] Usually called a mulatto, sometimes a slave; and in the *American Historical Record* for December, 1872, he is held to have been a half-breed Indian. [George Livermore gives us a glimpse of the past life of Crispus Attucks as a slave, in his "Historical Research on Negroes as Slaves," in *Mass. Hist. Soc. Proc.* 1862, Aug., p. 173. See also *N. E. Hist. and Geneal. Reg.*, Oct. 1859, p. 300. — ED.]

[3] [See Sumner's *East Boston*, p. 171. — ED.]

men from a second discharge, and ordered them back to the main guard. The drums beat to arms, and several companies of the Twenty-ninth formed, under Colonel Carr, in three divisions, in the neighborhood of the Town House. And now the alarm was everywhere given. The church bells were rung, the town drums beat to arms, and King Street was soon thronged with citizens who poured in from all directions. The sight of the mangled bodies of the slain sent terror and indignation through their ranks. The excitement surpassed anything which Boston had ever known before. It was indeed a "night of consternation." No one knew what would happen next; but in that awful hour the people were guided by wise and prudent leaders, who restrained their passions and turned to the law for justice. About ten o'clock the Lieut.-Governor appeared on the scene and called for Captain Preston, to whom he put some sharp and searching questions. Forced by the crowd he then went to the Town House, and soon appeared on the balcony, where he spoke with much feeling and power concerning the unhappy event, and promised to order an inquiry in the morning, saying "the law should have its course; he would live and die by the law." On being informed that the people would not disperse until Captain Preston was arrested, he at once ordered a court of inquiry; and after consultation with the military officers, he succeeded in having the troops removed to their barracks, after which the people began to disperse. Preston's examination lasted three hours, and resulted in his being bound over for trial. The soldiers were also placed under arrest. It was three o'clock in the morning before Hutchinson retired to his house. By his judicious exertions he succeeded in calming a tumult which, had it been left to itself, might in a single night have involved the town in a conflict of much greater proportions. Early in the morning, large numbers of people from the surrounding country flocked into the town to learn the details of the tragedy, and to confer with the citizens as to what was to be done. Faneuil Hall was thrown open for an informal meeting at eleven o'clock. The town clerk, William Cooper, acted as chairman until the selectmen could be summoned from the council chamber, where they were in conference with the Lieut.-Governor. On their appearance, Thomas Cushing was chosen moderator; and Dr. Cooper, brother of the town clerk, opened the meeting with prayer. Several witnesses brought in testimony concerning the events of the previous night. A committee of fifteen, including Adams, Cushing, Hancock, and Molineux, was chosen to wait on the Lieut.-Governor and inform him that the inhabitants and soldiery could no longer live together in safety; and that nothing could restore peace and prevent further carnage but the immediate removal of the troops.[1] In the afternoon at three o'clock a regular town-meeting was convened at the same place, by legal warrant, to consider what measures could be taken to preserve the

[1] [Dr. Belknap records an anecdote told by Governor Hancock, of the trepidation which seized Hutchinson when the committee went to him and demanded the removal of the troops after the massacre. *Mass. Hist. Soc. Proc.*, March, 1858, p. 308. — Ed.]



June 29. 1774.

In the Name & by order of
the House of Representatives
I am with respect
your most humble Sert
Thomas Cushing Speaker[1]

[1] [This cut follows a painting which has for many years hung in the Essex Institute, Salem, and is believed, from the costume, to represent the Patriot of this name; though the earlier



SAMUEL ADAMS.[1]

peace of the town. The attendance was so large that the meeting was adjourned to the Old South, which was soon crowded to its utmost capacity.

Speaker of the same name, who died in 1748, may possibly have been the sitter. The painting itself has no inscription, as the courteous Librarian, Dr. Henry Wheatland, informs me. In 1876 a descendant caused a copy of it to be made for Independence Hall, Philadelphia, in the belief that it represented the later Thomas Cushing. He was born in Bromfield Street, on the spot long occupied by the public house of that name. — ED.]

[1] [This cut follows the larger of Copley's portraits of Adams, and was painted when he was forty-nine. The smaller and later one has already been given in Vol. II. p. 438. The present picture for many years hung in Faneuil Hall, and is now in the Art Museum; it has been engraved before in Wells's *Life of Samuel Adams*, vol. i., in Bancroft's *United States*, vol. vii., and elsewhere. It represents the Patriot, clad in dark red, defending the rights of the people under the

Samuel Adams presented the report of the committee, which was that they could not obtain a promise of the removal of more than one of the regiments at present. "Both regiments or none!" was the cry with which the meeting received this announcement. The answer was voted to be unsatisfactory; and another committee was appointed, consisting of Samuel Adams, John Hancock, William Molineux, William Phillips, Joseph Warren, Joshua Henshaw, and Samuel Pemberton, to inform the Lieut.-Governor that nothing less than the total and immediate removal of the troops would satisfy the people. At a late hour the committee returned with a favorable report, which was received by the meeting with expressions of the greatest satisfaction. Before adjourning, a strong military watch was provided for; and the whole subject of the public defence was left in the hands of a "committee of safety," consisting of those who had just waited on the Lieut.-Governor.

On Thursday, March 8, the funeral of the slain was an occasion of mournful interest to the whole community. The stores were generally closed. The bells of Boston, Charlestown, Cambridge, and Roxbury were tolled. Never before, it was said, was there so large an assemblage in the streets of Boston. The procession started from the scene of the massacre in King Street, and proceeded through the main street six deep, followed by a long train of carriages, to the Middle or Granary Burying-ground, where the bodies of the victims were deposited in one grave.

After the removal of the troops to the Castle, nothing occurred to disturb the usual quiet of the town. The people waited patiently for the law to have its course. In October, Preston's case came on for trial in the Superior Court, followed in November by that of the soldiers implicated in the massacre. Through the exertions of Samuel Adams and others, the best legal talent in the province was secured on both sides. The prosecution was conducted by Robert Treat Paine, in the absence of the king's attorney.[1] Auchmuty, the prisoners' counsel, had the valuable assistance of John Adams and Josiah Quincy, the distinguished Patriots, who generously consented to take the position, — a severe ordeal at such a time, — in order that the town might be free from any charge of unfairness, and that the accused might have the advantage of every legal indulgence.[2] As a

Charter, — as he may be supposed to have appeared when he confronted Hutchinson and his council on the day after the massacre. Wells, *Life of Adams*, i. 475. The Copley head of Sam Adams was engraved by J. Norman in *An Impartial History of the War in America*, Boston, 1781. The journals of the Boston committee of correspondence, as well as the papers of Sam Adams, are in the possession of Bancroft the historian. Frothingham, *Life of Warren*, p. vii. Wells, *Life of Sam Adams*, vol. i. pp. vi. and x., gives a particular account of the Adams papers. Bancroft's *United States*, p. vi. preface. See an estimate of Adams in Mr. Goddard's ch. — ED.]

[1] [This was Jonathan Sewall, who, as John Adams says, "disappeared." It is probable that Samuel Quincy — a few months later to be made solicitor-general — assisted Paine, as stated by Ward in his edition of *Curwen's Journal*, and by Mr. Morse in Vol. IV.; though I find no contemporary authority for such statement, unless what John Adams says (*Works*, x. 201) in connection with the soldiers' trial applies as well to Preston's. Quincy is known, however, to have been on the Government side in the soldiers' trials. — ED.]

[2] [See the chapter on "The Bench and Bar," by John T. Morse, Jr., in Vol. IV. — ED.]



Josiah Quincy jun.[1]

result of the trial, Preston was acquitted; six of the soldiers were brought in "not guilty;" and two were found guilty of manslaughter, branded in the

[1] [Of this picture there is this account by Miss E. S. Quincy in Mason's *Life of Gilbert Stuart*, p. 244: "There was an engraving that his widow, Mrs. Abigail Quincy, considered an excellent likeness. This print, Stuart had declined to copy; but after reading the memoir of J. Quincy, Jr., published in 1825, he said: 'I must paint the portrait of that man;' and requested that the print, and the portrait of his brother Samuel Quincy, by Copley, should be sent to his studio." Miss Quincy says in a private letter: "The portrait was entirely satisfactory to my father and Mrs. Storer. The cast in his eye was one of his characteristics which they would not have allowed to be omitted." Jonathan Mason, who studied law in Mr. Quincy's office, Mr. Gardiner Greene, who saw him in London, Dr. Holbrook, of Milton, and many others testified to the likeness. There is an estimate of Quincy in Mr. Goddard's chapter in this volume. Quincy lived on the present Washington Street, a little south of Milk Street.

hand in open court, and then discharged. These trials must ever be regarded as a signal instance of that desire for impartial justice which characterized the American people throughout the stormy period which ushered in the Revolution.[1]

The manuscript of instructions to the representatives of the town, in his handwriting (1770), is noted in *Mass. Hist. Soc. Proc.*, December, 1873, p. 216. See also Frothingham's *Warren*, p. 156. His family relations can be traced in Vol. II. p. 547, and in the accounts of the Bromfield and Phillips family in the same volume pp. 543, 548. His father-in-law was William Phillips, who was the son of the Rev. Samuel Phillips of Andover, and who coming to Boston entered into business connections with Edward Bromfield, a rich merchant, whose daughter he afterward married, in 1764, and whose house on Beacon Street, figured in Vol. II., p. 521, he bought and lived in till his death in 1804. He amassed a large fortune, which has been transmitted to our day, though now mainly possessed by a collateral branch of the family. He took the Patriot side in the Revolution; and in August, 1774, Josiah Quincy, Jr., writes to Samuel Adams, then in Philadelphia: "It is very difficult to keep our poor in order. Mr. Phillips has done wonders among them. I do not know what we should do without him." After his daughter (Mrs. Quincy) lost her husband in 1775, she with her young son, the future President Quincy, lived with her father till 1786. Mr. Phillips's two younger daughters — twins, born in 1756, Sarah and Hannah — married respectively Edward Dowse and Major Samuel Shaw, who had been an aid to General Knox

in the Revolution. Both were pioneers in opening trade with China after the war, and Shaw's memoir has been written by President Quincy. Shaw lived in Bulfinch Place, in a house built for him in 1793 by Charles Bulfinch; and it is to-day, shorn of its ample grounds, known as Hotel Waterston. An account of Phillips can be found in the *American Quarterly Register*, xiii., No. 1. — Ed.]

[1] For details see *Lives of John Adams and Josiah Quincy*. The Brief used by the former is in the Boston Public Library. [It is a small brochure of ten leaves, six by four inches, fastened by a pin, and four of the leaves are blank. The annexed *fac-simile* is of the opening paragraph. Kidder, who formerly owned the document, has printed it in his *Boston Massacre*, p. 10.



Sampson Salter Blowers, who assisted Adams and Quincy, had graduated at Harvard in 1763,



and was only made a barrister in 1773; and in the next year married a daughter of Benjamin Kent, with whom he went to Nova Scotia at the time of the loyalist exodus. The presiding judge was the younger Lynde, whose portrait is



given in Vol. II. p. 558. All that remains of his charge is given in the appendix of *The Diaries of Benjamin Lynde, and of Benjamin Lynde, Jr.* Boston, privately printed, 1880.

John Adams wrote to J. Morse in 1816 (*Works of John Adams*, x. 201) that the report of Preston's trial "was taken down, and transmitted to England, by a Scottish or English stenographer, without any known authority but his own. The British Government have never permitted it to see the light, and probably never will." When the trial of William Wemms and seven other soldiers came on, Nov. 27, 1770, the same short-hand writer, John Hodgson, was employed; and the published report, — entitled *The Trial of William Wemms, . . . for the Murder of Crispus Attucks. . . . Published by permission of the Court. . . . Boston: printed by J. Fleeming, and sold at his Printing Office, nearly opposite the White Horse Tavern in Newbury Street. M.DCC.LXX.*, — makes a duodecimo of two hundred and seventeen pages. It gives the evidence and pleas of counsel. The last seven pages are occupied with a report, "from the minutes of a gentleman who attended," of the trial, December 12, of Edward Manwaring and

Previous to 1770 the people of Boston had celebrated the Gunpowder Plot annually with public demonstrations. After the Boston massacre, the

others, who were accused by several persons of firing on the crowd during the massacre from an adjacent window in the Custom House; but they were easily acquitted. This little volume was reprinted in Boston in 1807 and 1824, and again in Kidder's monograph in 1870. The plan of King Street, used at the trials, prepared by Paul Revere, is in the collection of Judge Mellen Chamberlain, of the Boston Public Library. An examination of the reports of the trial is made in P. W. Chandler's *American Criminal Trials*, i.

A minute narrative of the events was printed between black lines in the *Boston Gazette* of March 12, but the papers of the day made few references to the event till after the trial, when more or less discontent with the verdict was manifested. Such particularly marked a series of articles in the *Gazette*, signed "Vindex" (Sam Adams), which reflected upon the arguments of the counsel for defence. Buckingham, *Reminiscences*, i. 168.

Some verses inscribed upon one of the pictures of the massacre closed as follows, referring to Boston and Preston: —

> "Should venal courts, the scandal of the land,
> Snatch the relentless villain from her hand,
> Keen execrations, on this plate inscribed,
> Shall reach a judge who never can be bribed."

A letter from William Palfrey to John Wilkes, dated Boston, March 13 (1770), is printed in *Mass. Hist. Soc. Proc.*, March, 1863, p. 480. (See also Sparks, *American Biography*, new series, vol. viii.) And on p. 484 is printed one from Thomas Hutchinson to Lord Hillsborough on the same theme.

There are some particulars entered upon the Town Records of the statements made at the meeting at Faneuil Hall the next forenoon; but so many were ready to testify, that a committee was appointed to gather the evidence. The annexed autographs are attached to a letter addressed to the agent of Massachusetts in London, the original of which is in the Lee collection of papers in the University of Virginia Library; and with the letter was sent a copy of a *Narrative* authorized by the town. A similar letter, and other copies, were sent to various important people in England, — a list of whom, together with the letter, is printed at the end of some copies of the *Narrative*, which was also probably drawn up by the same gentlemen, and, as printed, is called *A short Narrative of the Horrid*



Massacre in Boston perpetrated in the evening of the Fifth Day of March, 1770, by Soldiers of the XXIX^th^ Regiment, with some Observations on the State of Things prior to that Catastrophe. Boston: printed by order of the Town, by Messrs. Edes & Gill. MDCCLXX. It had an appendix of depositions, including one of Jeremiah Belknap; but another, of Joseph Belknap, is contained in the *Belknap Papers*, i. 69, in the cabinet of the Massachusetts Historical Society. A large folding plate showed the scene in State Street. It was immediately reprinted in London, in at least three editions, — two by W. Bingley, in Newgate Street, with the large folding plate re-engraved; and the third by E. and C. Dilby, with a smaller plate, a *fac-simile* of which, somewhat reduced, is given on the next page. The supplement of the *Boston Evening Post*, June 18, 1770, has news from London, May 5, announcing the republication of it, and stating that the frontispiece was engraved from a copper-plate print sent over with the "authenticated narrative."

Copies of this *Short Narrative* were sent at once to England, but the remainder of the edition was not published, for fear of giving "an undue bias to the minds of the jury," till after the trial, when *Additional Observations*, of twelve pages, were added to it. These were likewise published separately. Both of these documents were reprinted in New York in 1849, and again at Albany in 1870, in Mr. Kidder's *History of the Boston Massacre*. In this supplemental publication it was intimated that the friends of Government had sent despatches "home" "to represent the town in a disadvantageous light." It is certain that a tract did appear shortly in London, called: *A fair Account of the late*

fifth of March was observed until the peace of 1783,[1] when the Fourth of July celebration was substituted by the town authorities. Unquestionably the influence of the Boston massacre upon the growing sentiment of independence throughout the colonies was very great.[2] Public opinion was immediately shaped by it, and the remaining ties binding America to Britain were everywhere visibly relaxed. "On that night," wrote John

unhappy Disturbance at Boston in New England; extracted from the Depositions that have been made concerning it by persons of all parties; with an Appendix containing some affidavits and other evidences relating to this affair, not mentioned in the Narrative of it that has been published at Boston. London: printed for B. White, in Fleet Lane; MDCCLXX. There is a copy in Harvard College Library. It is the Government view of the massacre, and is duly fortified by counter depositions, chiefly by officers and men of the garrison. Hutchinson has given his account of it in his posthumous third volume, and Gordon in his first volume. Stedman's account in his *American War* is also at variance with the town's narrative.

Of the later historians Mr. Frothingham in the last of his papers on "The Sam Adams Regiments" (*Atlantic Monthly*, November, 1863), and in his *Life of Warren*, ch. vi., has given a very excellent account, "carefully collating the evidence that appears to be authentic;" but he confesses it is vain to reconcile all statements. The events are also minutely described in Wells's *Life of Samuel Adams*, i. 308. Bancroft, *United States*, vol. vi. ch. xliii., examines the evidence for provocation, and concludes Preston ordered the firing. He cites, through the chapter, his authorities. — ED.]



The Massacre perpetrated in King Street Boston on March 5th 1770, in which Mess^rs Sam^l Gray Sam^l Maverick James Caldwell Crispus Attucks Patrick Carr were Killed, six others Wounded two of them Mortally

[1] Orations were delivered on the successive anniversaries by Thomas Young, Joseph Warren, Benjamin Church, John Hancock, Joseph Warren, Peter Thacher, Benjamin Hichborn, Jonathan W. Austin, William Tudor, Jonathan Mason, Thomas Dawes, George R. Minot, and Thomas Welsh. [These, having been printed separately, were collected and issued by Peter Edes in 1785, and reissued in 1807. There are accounts of them and their authors in Loring's *Hundred Boston Orators*. Paul Revere took the occasion of the first anniversary of the massacre, in 1771, to rouse the sensibilities of the crowd by giving illuminated pictures of the event, with allegorical accompaniments, at the windows of his house in North Square. "The spectators," says the account in the *Gazette*, "were struck with solemn silence, and their countenances covered with a melancholy gloom." — ED.]

[2] [See the letter to Franklin in *Mass. Hist. Soc. Proc.*, November, 1865. Also Sparks's *Franklin*, vii. 499. — ED.]

Adams long afterward, "the formation of American Independence was laid." "From that moment," said Mr. Webster on one occasion, "we may date the severance of the British empire."

On the very day of the Boston massacre Lord North brought in a bill to repeal the Townshend revenue act, with the exception of the preamble and the duty on tea, which were retained to signify the continued supremacy of Parliament. This proposal met with much opposition, but was finally carried, and approved by the king on April 12.

As the great principle at issue was not relinquished, this new measure of the Government gave but little satisfaction to the colonists. Trade, however, revived, and before the end of 1770 it was open in everything but tea.[1]

In the month of September Hutchinson received a royal order in effect introducing martial law into Massachusetts, in so far as to compel him to give up the fortress to General Gage, or such officer as he might appoint. This order was in direct contravention of the charter of the province, which gave the command of the militia and the forts to the civil Governor. After a little hesitation Hutchinson decided to obey the order, and, without consulting the council, he at once handed over the Castle to Colonel Dalrymple; and from that hour it remained in the possession of England until the evacuation of Boston in March, 1776. The Provincial Assembly, meeting at Cambridge for the third time, and keeping a day of fasting, humiliation, and prayer, entered a solemn protest against the new and insupportable grievances under which they labored.[2] At this time Franklin, Boston's honored son, was elected as the agent of Massachusetts to represent her cause before the king.[3] Certainly no better choice could have been made. In the fulness of his ripened powers, possessed of rare wisdom and integrity, and animated by a spirit of fervent patriotism, he discharged the grave duties of his position with conspicuous fidelity and zeal.

The next year was not marked by any very notable event. Hutchinson, who had now received his coveted commission as Governor, maintained a controversy with the Assembly upon several matters of legislation, and

[1] The self-imposed restrictions adopted by the colonists in reference to foreign articles had produced a great effect in checking extravagance, promoting domestic industry and economy, and opening to the people new sources of wealth. Home-made articles, which at first came into use from necessity, soon became fashionable. At Harvard College the graduating class of 1770 took their degrees in homespun.

[2] [John Adams was now a representative from Boston, succeeding Bowdoin, who had gone into the Council. See *John Adams's Works*, ii. 233. "Although Sam Adams was now the master-mover, John Adams seems to have succeeded to the post of legal adviser, which had been filled by Oxenbridge Thacher and James Otis." The four "Boston seats" were thus filled by Cushing (the Speaker), Hancock, Sam Adams, and John Adams; and to show their influence the journals indicate that three, and sometimes all of them, were on every important committee for a session which was much concerned with political movements. John Adams was at this period a resident of Boston from April, 1768, to April, 1771; but he still retained his office in Boston after removing his family to Braintree; and again he established a home in Queen Street, opposite the Court House, in 1772. — Ed.]

[3] [The choice of Franklin was made Oct. 24, 1770; his appointment, signed by Thomas Cushing, speaker, is among the Lee Papers, University of Virginia. See Mr. Towle's chapter in Vol. II. — Ed.]

arbitrarily insisted upon their meeting in Cambridge, until the opposition to it became so strong that he was obliged to consent to a removal to Boston.[1] The House soon after censured the Governor for accepting a salary from the king in violation of the charter; and the popular indignation was still further aroused when it became known that royal stipends were provided for the judges in the province. This led to a town-meeting (Oct. 28, 1772), at which an address to his Excellency was prepared, requesting information of the truth of the report. The Governor declined to make public any of his official advices. Another petition was drafted at an adjourned meeting, requesting the Governor to convene the Assembly on the day to which it stood prorogued (December 2); and at the same time the meeting expressed its horror of the reported judicial establishment, as contrary not only to the charter but to the fundamental principles of common law. This petition also was rejected in a reply which was read several times at an adjourned meeting and voted "not satisfactory." It was then resolved that the inhabitants of Boston "have ever had and ought to have a right to petition the king, or his representative, for a redress of such grievances as they feel, or for preventing of such as they have reason to apprehend; and to communicate their sentiments to other towns." Adams now stood up and made that celebrated motion, which gave visible shape to the American Revolution, and endowed it with life and strength. The record[2] says: —

"It was then moved by Mr. Samuel Adams that a committee of correspondence[3] be appointed, to consist of twenty-one persons, to state the rights of the colonists, and of this province in particular, as men and Christians, and as subjects; and to communicate and publish the same to the several towns, and to the world, as the sense of this town, with the infringements and violations thereof that have been or from time to time may be made."

The motion was carried by a nearly unanimous vote; but some of the leading men were not prepared to serve on the committee. It was seen that the labors would be arduous, prolonged, and gratuitous; and although they did not oppose, neither did they cordially support a measure which was really greater than they imagined. The committee, however, was well

[1] [The instructions of the town, May 25, 1772, to Cushing and the other representatives, are given in the *Mass. Hist. Soc. Proc.*, January, 1871, p. 9. The House later prepared an address of remonstrance to the king against taxation without representation, and, July 14, 1772, it was despatched, signed by Cushing. An original is among the Lee Papers, in the University of Virginia. — Ed.]

[2] *Boston Town Records*, November, 1772.

[3] [John Adams said that Sam Adams "invented" the committee of correspondence. Frothingham, *Life of Warren*, p. 200. There has been some controversy about the origin of these committees; but Bancroft, who has their papers, avers positively that Gordon's opinion (i. 312) of the idea originating with James Warren of Plymouth is erroneous. Bancroft's *United States*, vi. 428. See further, Wells's *Samuel Adams*, i. 509, ii. 62; Frothingham's *Rise of the Republic*, pp. 284, 312, 327; Barry's *Massachusetts*, ii. 448, and other references in Winsor's *Handbook*, p. 20. The town's committee of correspondence must not be confounded with the Assembly's committee. See R. Frothingham in *Mass. Hist. Soc. Proc.*, Dec. 16, 1873. See earlier in this chapter for Mayhew's suggestion. See also Hutchinson, iii. 361; and Gordon, i. 314. — Ed.]



LIEUT.-GOVERNOR ANDREW OLIVER.[1]

constructed, with Adams and Warren and other citizens of well known character and the highest patriotism. Otis, though broken in health, was named chairman, as a compliment for his former services.

[1] [This cut follows Copley's portrait of Andrew Oliver, owned by Dr. F. E. Oliver, by whose kind permission it is copied. Perkins's *Copley*, p. 90. For his family connections see Mr. Whitmore's chapter in Vol. II. p. 539, and his more extended genealogy of the Olivers in *N. E. Hist. and Geneal. Reg.*, April, 1865, p. 101. The two sons of Daniel Oliver (who died 1732, leaving a bequest to the town; see Vol. II. p. 539) were Andrew Oliver, the Lieut.-Governor (who died 1774, and was father of Andrew, judge and mandamus councillor), and Chief-Justice Peter Oliver. They had close family relations with Governor Hutchinson, for Andrew's second wife, Mary, was sister of Hutchinson's wife, the two being daughters of William Sanford; and Dr. Peter Oliver, son of the chief justice, married Sarah, daughter of Governor Hutchinson. Andrew, the mandamus councillor, married a sister of the second Judge Lynde, who presided at the massacre trials. The family of the Lieut.-Governor, by his second wife, were refugees with their uncle, the chief-justice. — ED.]

This committee of correspondence met the next day and chose William Cooper as clerk. By a unanimous vote they gave to each other the pledge of honor "not to divulge any part of the conversation at their meetings to any person whatsoever, excepting what the committee itself should make known."



The work to be done was divided between them. Adams was appointed to prepare a statement of the rights of the colonists; Warren of the several violations of those rights; and Church was to draft a letter to the other towns.

On November 20 the report was presented at a legal meeting in Faneuil Hall. The statement of rights and of grievances, and the letter to the towns, were masterly presentations of the cause, and carried conviction throughout the province. Plymouth, Marblehead, Roxbury, and Cambridge responded at once to the call; and it was not long before committees of correspondence were everywhere established. The other Colonies accepted the plan.[1] Virginia saw in it the prospect of union throughout the continent. So did South Carolina. "An American Congress," wrote Samuel Adams to Arthur Lee (April 9, 1773), "is no longer the fiction of a political enthusiast."[2]

In the spring of 1773 the East India Company, finding itself embarrassed from the excessive accumulation of teas in England, owing to the persistent refusal of American merchants to import them, applied to Parliament for assistance, and obtained an act empowering the Company to export teas to America without paying the ordinary duty in England. This would enable the Company to sell at such low rates that it was thought the colonists would purchase, even with the tax of threepence on the pound. Accordingly ships were laden with the article and despatched to Charleston, Philadelphia, New York, and Boston, and persons were selected in each of these ports to act as consignees, or "tea commissioners" as they were called.

[1] [The report of the committee of correspondence, made Nov. 20, 1772, was, by order of the town, printed by Edes & Gill, as *The Votes and Proceedings of the Freeholders and other Inhabitants.* Frothingham, *Warren*, p. 211, etc., has much to show the effect this meeting was having throughout the colonies. — Ed.]

[2] Secret letters, written by Governor Hutchinson and Lieut.-Governor Oliver to friends in England, favoring military intervention and otherwise injuring the cause of the colonists, were discovered about this time through the agency of Franklin, and forwarded to the Patriots in Boston. The result was a formal petition to the king for the removal of the odious functionaries. These letters were printed in Boston in 1773, and in London in 1774. *Mass. Hist. Soc. Proc.*, 1878. [See further on this matter, with a note on the authorities, Vol. II. p. 86 John Adams saw them as early as March 22, 1773. (*Works*, ii. 318.) The letters were first published in Boston, June 16, 1773. Thomas Newell's "diary" in *Proc.*, October, 1877, p. 339. — Ed.]

When this news became known, all America was in a flame. The people were not to be duped by any such appeal to their cupidity. They had taken their stand upon a principle, and not until that was recognized would they withdraw their opposition. It seemed strange that England had not discerned that fact long before.

Nowhere was the feeling more intense on the subject than in Boston. The consignees were prominent men and friends of the Governor.[1] On the night of November 1 they were each one summoned to appear on the following Wednesday noon, at Liberty Tree, to resign their commissions. Handbills were also posted over the town, inviting citizens to meet at the same place.[2] On the day appointed, the bells rang from eleven to twelve o'clock, and the town-crier summoned the people to meet at Liberty Tree, which was decorated with a large flag. About five hundred assembled, including many of the leading Patriots. As the consignees failed to appear, a committee was appointed to wait upon them and request their resignation; and, in case they refused, to present a resolve to them declaring them to be enemies of their country. The committee, accompanied by many of the people, repaired to Clarke's warehouse and had a brief parley with the consignees, who refused to resign their trust.

A legal town-meeting was now called for, and the selectmen issued a warrant for one to be held on the fifth.[3] It was largely attended, and Hancock[4] was chosen moderator. A series of eight resolves was adopted, similar to those which had been recently passed in Philadelphia, and extensively circulated through the press. The consignees were again, through a committee, asked to resign; and again they refused, and the meeting adjourned.

On the seventeenth a vessel arrived, announcing that the tea-ships were on the way to Boston and might be hourly expected. Another legal meeting was immediately notified for the next day, at which Hancock was again the moderator. Word was sent to the consignees that it was the desire of the town that they would give a final answer whether they would resign their appointment. The answer came that they could not comply with the re-

[1] Two of them were his sons, Elisha and Thomas; the others were Richard Clarke and sons, Benj. Faneuil, Jr., and Joshua Winslow.

[2] Draper's *Gazette* of November 3 contained the following: —

"*To the Freemen of this and the neighboring towns:*

"GENTLEMEN, — You are desired to meet at Liberty Tree this day at twelve o'clock at noon; then and there to hear the persons, to whom the tea shipped by the East India Company is consigned, make a public resignation of their office as consignees, upon oath; and also swear that they will reship any teas that may be consigned to them by said Company, by the first vessel sailing for London.

"Boston, Nov. 3, 1773. O. C., *Secretary.*

"☞ Show us the man that dare take down this."

Several of these handbills are in possession of the Mass. Hist. Society.

[3] This warrant is now in the possession of Judge Mellen Chamberlain.

[4] [Revere's portrait of Hancock is given in the text. It appeared in the *Royal Amer. Mag.*, March, 1774, which contains also Hancock's massacre oration of that year. On Nov. 11, 1773, Hutchinson had directed Hancock, as colonel of the cadets, to hold them in readiness for service. Frothingham, *Life of Warren*, p. 249, mentions the original of this order as being in the hands of the late Col. J. W. Sever. A curious engraving of "His Exᶜʸ John Hancock, late President of the American Congress, J. Norman, sc.," appeared in *An Impartial History of the War in America*, Boston, 1781, vol. i. On the Hancock papers (most of which are printed in the *American Archives*) see *Massachusetts Historical Society Proceedings*, January, 1858, p. 271 and December, 1857; and Vol. IV. of this History, p. 5, *note*. — ED.]

quest.[1] Upon this the meeting dissolved, without passing any vote or expressing any opinion. "This sudden dissolution," says Hutchinson,[2] "struck more terror into the consignees than the most minatory resolves."

The whole matter was now understood to be in the hands of the committee of correspondence, who constituted the virtual government of the province.

On Sunday, November 28, the ship "Dartmouth," Captain Hall, after a sixty days' passage, appeared in the harbor, with one hundred and four-

The Hon.ble JOHN HANCOCK. Esq.r

teen chests of tea.[3] There was no time to be lost. Sunday though it was, the selectmen and the committee of correspondence held meetings to take immediate action against the entry of the tea. The consignees had gone to the Castle; but a promise was obtained from Francis Rotch, the owner of the vessel, that it should not be entered until Tuesday. The towns around Boston[4] were then invited to attend a mass meeting in Faneuil Hall the next morning.[5] Thousands were ready to respond to

[1] The answer is given in Frothingham's *Life of Warren*, p. 251.

[2] *History*, iii. 426.

[3] [The next morning, twenty-ninth, the vessel came up and anchored off Long Wharf (*Massachusetts Gazette*, November 29). The journal of the "Dartmouth" is in *Traits of the Tea-Party*, p. 259. — Ed.

[4] Dorchester, Roxbury, Brookline, Cambridge, and Charlestown.

[5] The following placard appeared on Monday morning: —

"Friends! Brethren! Countrymen!

"That worst of plagues, the detested Tea, shipped for this port by the East India Company, is now arrived in this harbor. The hour of destruction, or manly opposition to

this summons, and the meeting was obliged to adjourn to the Old South. Boston, it was said, had never seen so large a gathering.[1] It was unanimously resolved, upon the motion of Samuel Adams, that the tea should be sent back, and that no duty should be paid on it. "The only way to get rid of it," said Young, "is to throw it overboard." At an adjourned meeting in the afternoon, Mr. Rotch entered his protest against the proceedings; but the meeting, without a dissenting voice, passed the significant vote that if Mr. Rotch entered the tea he would do so at his peril. Captain Hall was also cautioned not to allow any of the tea to be landed. To guard the ship during the night, a volunteer watch of twenty-five persons was appointed, under Captain Edward Proctor. "Out of great tenderness" to the consignees, the meeting adjourned to Tuesday morning, to allow further time for consultation. The answer, which was given jointly, then was that it was not in the power of the consignees to send the tea back; but they were ready to store it till they could hear from their constituents. Before action could be taken on this reply, Greenleaf, the Sheriff of Suffolk, entered with a proclamation from the Governor, charging the inhabitants with violating the good and wholesome laws of the province, and "warning, exhorting, and requiring them, and each of them there unlawfully assembled, forthwith to disperse."[2] This communication was received with hisses and a unanimous vote not to disperse. At this juncture, Copley the artist, son-in-law of Clarke, tendered his services as mediator between the people and the consignees, and was allowed two hours for the purpose; but after going to the Castle he returned with a report which was voted to be "not in the least degree satisfactory." In the afternoon, Rotch and Hall, yielding to the demands of the hour, agreed that the tea should return, without touching land or paying duty. A similar promise was obtained from the owners of two other tea-ships, which were daily expected; and resolutions were passed against such merchants as had even "inadvertently" imported tea while subject to duty. Armed patrols were appointed for the night; and six post-riders were selected to alarm the neighboring towns, if necessary. A report of the proceedings of the meeting was officially transmitted to every seaport in Massachusetts; also to New York and Philadelphia, and to England.[3]

In a short time the other tea-ships, the "Eleanor" and the "Beaver," arrived and, by order of the committee, were moored near the "Dartmouth" at Griffin's Wharf,[4] that one guard might answer for all. Under the revenue laws the ships could not be cleared in Boston with the tea on board, nor

the machinations of tyranny, stares you in the face. Every friend to his country, to himself and posterity, is now called upon to meet at Faneuil Hall at nine o'clock THIS DAY (at which time the bells will ring), to make a united and successful resistance to this last, worst, and most destructive measure of Administration."

Boston Gazette, Nov. 29, 1773; Wells's *Life of S. Adams*, ii. 110. [The original draft of the call to the committees of the neighboring towns, in Warren's hand, is owned by Mr. Bancroft. Frothingham's *Warren*, p. 255. — ED.]

[1] Jonathan Williams was chosen moderator; and the business of the meeting was conducted by Adams, Hancock, Young, Molineux, and Warren.

[2] Hutchinson, *Massachusetts Bay*, iii. 432.

[3] For accounts of this meeting see *Boston Post-Boy*, *News-Letter*, and especially the *Gazette* for Dec. 6, 1773.

[4] Now Liverpool Wharf, near the foot of Pearl Street.

could they be entered in England; and, moreover, on the twentieth day from their arrival they would be liable to seizure. Whatever was done, therefore, must be done soon. The Patriot leaders were all sincerely anxious to have the tea returned to London peaceably, and they left nothing undone to accomplish this object. On the eleventh of December the owner of the "Dartmouth" was summoned before the committee, and asked why he had not kept his agreement to send his ship back with the tea. He replied that it was out of his power to do so. "The ship must go," was the answer. "The people of Boston and the neighboring towns absolutely require and expect it."[1] Hutchinson, in the meantime, had taken measures to prevent her sailing. No vessel was allowed to put to sea without his permit; the guns at the Castle were loaded, and Admiral Montagu had sent two warships to guard the passages out of the harbor.

The committees of the towns were in session on the thirteenth. On the fourteenth, two days before the time would expire, a meeting at the Old South again summoned Rotch and enjoined upon him, at his peril, to apply for a clearance. He did so, accompanied by several witnesses. The collector refused to give his answer until the next day, and the meeting adjourned to Thursday, the sixteenth, the last day of the twenty before confiscation would be legal. For two days the Boston committee of correspondence had been holding consultations of the greatest importance.

"That little body of stout-hearted men were making history that should endure for ages. Their secret deliberations, could they be exhumed from the dust of time, would present a curious page in the annals of Boston; but the seal of silence was upon the pen of the secretary, as well as upon the lips of the members."[2]

On Wednesday Rotch was again escorted to the Custom House, where both the collector and the comptroller "unequivocally and finally" refused to grant the "Dartmouth" a clearance unless her teas were discharged.

Thursday, December 16, came at last, — *dies iræ, dies illa!* — and Boston calmly prepared to meet the issue. At ten o'clock the Old South was filled from an outside assemblage that included two thousand people from the surrounding country. Rotch appeared and reported that a clearance had been denied him. He was then directed as a last resort to protest at once against the decision of the Custom House, and apply to the Governor for a passport to go by the Castle. Hutchinson, evidently anticipating such an emergency, had found it convenient to be at his country-seat on Milton Hill,[3] where it would require considerable time to reach him. Rotch was instructed to make all haste, and report to the meeting in the afternoon. At three o'clock the number of people in and around the Old South was estimated at seven thousand, — by far the largest gathering ever seen in Boston. Addresses

[1] Bancroft, vi. 482.

[2] Wells's *Life of Samuel Adams*, ii. 119.

[3] [The mansion which is delineated in Bryant and Gay's *History of the United States*, iii. 372, as Hutchinson's country-seat, is not Hutchinson's house but another on Milton Hill. The true house was taken down not long since. — Ed.]

were made by Samuel Adams, Young, Rowe, Quincy,[1] and others. "Who knows," said Rowe, "how tea will mingle with salt water?" a suggestion which was received with loud applause.[2] When the question was finally put to the vast assembly it was unanimously resolved that the tea should not be landed. It was now getting darker and darker, and the meeting-house could only be dimly lighted with a few candles; yet the people all remained, knowing that the great question must soon be decided. About six o'clock Rotch appeared and reported that he had waited on the Governor, but could not obtain a pass, as his vessel was not duly qualified. No sooner had he concluded than Samuel Adams arose and said: "This meeting can do nothing more to save the country."[3] Instantly a shout was heard at the porch; the war-whoop resounded, and a band of forty or fifty men, disguised as Indians, rushed by the door and hurried down toward the harbor,[4] followed by a throng of people; guards were carefully posted, according to previous arrangements, around Griffin's wharf to prevent the intrusion of spies. The "Mohawks," and some others accompanying them, sprang aboard the three tea-ships and emptied the contents of three hundred and forty-two chests of tea into the bay, "without the least injury to the vessels or any other property." No one interfered with them; no person was harmed; no tea was allowed to be carried away. There was no confusion, no noisy riot, no

[1] [The speech which Josiah Quincy, Jr. delivered at this meeting, Dec. 16, 1773, together with one of Otis in 1767, are the only reports at any length of all the speeches made in Boston public meetings from 1768 to 1775. Frothingham's *Warren*, p. 39. Quincy's *Life of Josiah Quincy, Jr.*, 2d ed. p. 124. Mr. Quincy's speech is preserved only in a letter which, after he had gone to England, he wrote to his wife from London, Dec. 14, 1774, and the words given by Gordon were copied from the manuscript still existing. It counselled moderation. *Mass. Hist. Soc. Proc.*, Dec. 16, 1873, Mr. Waterston's address. — Ed.]

[2] Niles, *Principles and Acts of the Revolution*, pp. 485, 486.

[3] Francis Rotch's information before the privy council. [The moderator of this meeting was William Phillips Savage. His portrait is owned by Mr. G. H. Emery. The original minutes, in the hand of William Cooper, of the meetings from Nov. 29, 1773, are preserved among the papers in the Charity Building. They show the names of the watch of twenty-five men, under Captain Proctor, who were to guard the ships that night; and later each successive watch was empowered to appoint its successors for the following night. The final report of Mr. Rotch is entered in the minutes for December 16, as follows: —

"Mr. Rotch attended and informed that he had demanded a pass for his vessel of the Governor, who answered that he was willing to grant anything consistent with the laws and his duty to the King, but that he could not give a pass unless the vessel was properly qualified from the Custom House; that he should make no distinction between this and any other vessel, provided she was properly cleared.

"Mr. Rotch was then asked whether he would send his vessel back with the tea under her present circumstances; he answered that he could not possibly comply, as he apprehended it would be to his risk. He was further asked whether he would land the tea; he answered he had no business with it unless he was properly called upon to do it, when he should attempt a compliance for his own security.

"*Voted*, that this meeting be dissolved; and it was accordingly dissolved."

Here the minutes end, the remaining leaves of the book being blank. — Ed.]

[4] [The conclave which had decided upon this movement had been held in the back office of Edes & Gill's printing house, on the site of the present *Daily Advertiser* building. A room over the office was often the meeting place of the Patriots, and the frequenters got to be known as the Long-Room Club. Drake, *Landmarks*, p. 81. There is some reason to believe that this was the office of Josiah Quincy, Jr. A letter about the punch-bowl used by the Patriots before going to the wharf is given in *Mass. Hist. Soc. Proc.*, December, 1871. Lossing, *Field-Book of the Revolution*, i. 499, gives the portrait of David Kinnison, the last survivor of the "Mohawks." — Ed.]

infuriated mob. The multitude stood by and looked on in solemn silence while the weird-looking figures,[1] made distinctly visible in the moonlight, removed the hatches, tore open the chests, and threw the entire cargo overboard. This strange spectacle lasted about three hours, and then the people all went home and the town was as quiet as if nothing had happened. The next day fragments of the tea were seen strewn along the Dorchester shore, carried thither by the wind and tide.[2] A formal declaration of the transaction was drawn up by the Boston committee; and Paul Revere was sent with despatches to New York and Philadelphia, where the news was received with the greatest demonstrations of joy.[3] In Boston the feeling was that of intense satisfaction proceeding from the consciousness of having exhausted every possible measure of legal redress before undertaking this bold and novel mode of asserting the rights of the people.[4] "We do console ourselves," said John Scollay, one of the selectmen, and an actor in the scene, "that we have acted constitutionally."[5] "This is the most magnificent movement of all," said John Adams.[6] "There

[1] The names of the actors in this scene, as well as of those who planned it, were not divulged till after the Revolutionary War. It is supposed that about one hundred and forty persons were engaged in it. [The "Dartmouth's" journal says one thousand people came on the wharf. The party actually boarding the ships has been estimated from seventeen to thirty, the former number being all that have been identified. See Frothingham in *Mass. Hist. Soc. Proc.*, Dec. 16, 1873, who thinks that the list given in Hewes's book is not accurate as respects those who boarded the ships. "Several of the party have been identified, but the claims presented for others are doubtful." John Adams refused to have the names given him. (*Works*, ii. 334.) Captain Henry Purkitt, who is called the last survivor of the party, died March 3, 1846, aged ninety-one. As to Hewes, see also Loring's *Hundred Boston Orators*, p. 554. — Ed.]

[2] Barry, ii. 473. [A small quantity of it is preserved in a phial in the Mass. Hist. Society's cabinet. Thomas Newell records in his diary, Jan. 1, 1774: "Last evening a number of persons went over to Dorchester and brought from thence part of a chest of tea, and burnt it in our Common the same evening." A fourth vessel of the tea-fleet was wrecked on the back side of Cape Cod. The Boston committee immediately sent a message in that direction. "The people of the Cape will we hope behave with propriety, and as becomes men resolved to serve their country." We next hear of this tea in a letter from Samuel Adams to James Warren, Jan. 10, 1774. "The tea which was cast on shore at the Cape has been brought up, and after much consultation landed at Castle William, the safe asylum for our inveterate enemies. . . . It is said that the Indians this way, if they had suspected the Marshpee tribe would have been so sick at the knee, would have marched on snow-shoes to have done the business for them." It seems that Clarke, one of the consignees, had despatched a lighter and brought the chests off. *Mass. Hist. Soc. Proc.*, Dec. 16, 1873. Vessels subsequently arriving were examined; and in March, 1774, twenty-eight and a half chests were similarly disposed of by similar "Indians." — Ed.]

[3] [Revere returned from this mission December 27; and bringing word that Governor Tryon had engaged to send the New York tea-ships back, all the Boston bells were rung the next morning. *Thomas Newell's Diary.* — Ed.]

[4] "Fast spread the tempest's darkening pall;
The mighty realms were troubled;
The storm broke loose, but first of all
The Boston teapot bubbled.

"The lurid morning shall reveal
A fire no king can smother,
When British flint and Boston steel,
Have clashed against each other!"

O. W. Holmes.

[5] Letter to Arthur Lee, Dec. 23, 1773.

[6] Diary, Dec. 17, 1773. [Two pages of this diary, of which the accompanying *fac-simile* is a


1773 Decr. 17th Last Night 3 Cargoes of Bohea
Tea were emptied into the Sea. This Morn
ing a Man of War Sails. —
This is the most magnificent Movement of all. —

is a dignity, a majesty, a sublimity, in this last effort of the Patriots that I greatly admire." [1]

The blow was now struck; the deed was done; and there was no retreat. The enemies of liberty talked of treason, arrests, and executions; but the Patriots almost everywhere rejoiced, and pledged themselves to support the common cause. Independence was now openly advocated; a congress was called for; and "Union" was the cry from New England to Carolina.[2]

When the news of the destruction of the tea reached England it produced a profound sensation, both in Government circles and among the people. Coercion was at once resolved upon as the only means of check-

fragment, are given in the *Mass. Hist. Soc. Proc.*, Dec. 16, 1873. — Ed.]

[1] Charles Waterton, the enterprising traveller and naturalist, of Walton Hall, Wakefield, Yorkshire, makes a humorous reference to the Tea-Party, in his autobiography, written between 1812 and 1824: "It is but some forty years ago our western brother had a dispute with his nurse about a cup of tea. She wanted to force the boy to drink it according to her own receipt. He said he did not like it, and that it absolutely made him ill. After a good deal of sparring, she took up the birch rod and began to whip him with uncommon severity. He turned upon her in self-defence, showed her to the outside of the nursery door, and never more allowed her to meddle with his affairs."

[2] [Among the contemporary sources for the understanding of these transactions may be named the following: G. R. T. Hewes, who was one of the participants, with the aid of B. B. Thacher, prepared *Traits of the Tea-Party*, N. Y. 1835 (see also *Retrospect of the Boston Tea-Party with a Memoir of Hewes*, by a citizen of New York, N. Y. 1834. *Brinley Catalogue*, Nos. 1681 and 1682); and in this book the names of fifty-eight actors in the scene are given. The names inscribed on the monument of Captain Peter Slater (who was one of the party) in Hope Cemetery, New Worcester, are sixty-three in number. Both lists include Moses Grant, William Molineaux, Paul Revere, G. T. R. Hewes, Thomas Melville, Samuel Sprague, Jonathan Hunnewell, John Prince, John Russell. (*Massachusetts Spy*, Dec. 16, 1873.) Sprague was the father of Charles Sprague; Russell was the father of Benjamin Russell. Hewes lived at the Bull's Head, an old house on the northeast corner of Water and Congress streets. He died Nov. 5, 1840, at ninety-eight. There are letters from Boston in 4 *Mass. Hist. Coll.* iv. 373; as also the examination of Dr. Williamson before the King's council, Feb. 19, 1774. A paper, "Information of Hugh Williamson" is in the Sparks MSS. Admiral Montagu, writing Dec. 17, 1773, to the Lords of the Admiralty, says he was never called upon for assistance, and he could easily have prevented the execution of the plan; and the *Evening Post*, May 16, 1774, ventured from the admiral's admission to draw the conclusion that Hutchinson and his party connived at the business. The first accounts received in England are given in the *Gentleman's Magazine*, 1774, p. 26. An account is in the *Boston Gazette*, Dec. 20, 1773, or Buckingham's *Reminiscences*, i. 169; a contemporary record in Andrews's letters in *Mass. Hist. Soc. Proc.*, 1865, p. 325; Thomas Newell's Diary in *Mass. Hist Soc. Proc.*, October, 1877; contemporary verses in *Mag. of Amer. History*, March, 1880; Hutchinson's narrative is in his *Massachusetts Bay*, iii. 430. Hutchinson's papers in the State House throw much light on these disturbed times, and some of his letters are copied by Frothingham in his paper in the *Mass. Hist. Soc. Proc.*, December, 1873. His interview with the king, July 1, 1774, after his return to England, as reported in his journal, and covering these transactions, has only of late years been made public. *Mass. Hist. Soc. Proc.*, October, 1877, p. 326. Other contemporary documents will be found in Force's *American Archives*, i.; Niles's *Principles and Acts of the Revolution*; Franklin's *Works*, viii.; John Adams's *Works*, ii. 323, 334, and ix. 333. An appeal of "Scævola" to the commissioners appointed for the sale of tea in America was printed as a broadside, and a copy is in the Sparks MSS. xlix. vol. ii. p. 115. Of the eclectic later accounts the fullest is in Frothingham's *Life of Warren*, ch. ix.; and in his paper in *Mass. Hist. Soc. Proc.*, Dec. 16, 1873, where will be found the contributions of others to that commemorative occasion. See also Bancroft, vi. ch. l.; Barry, *Massachusetts*, ii. ch. xiv. and xv.; Wells's *Sam. Adams*, ii.; Tudor's *Otis*, ch. xxi.; Snow's *Boston*; Niles's *Register*, 1827, p. 75; Lossing's *Field-Book*; and *Harper's Monthly*, iv. Also James Kimball in *Essex Institute Proceedings*. The English writers are May's *Constitutional History of England*, ii. 521; Massey's *England*, ii. ch. xviii.; Fitzmaurice's *Shelburne*, ii.; Macknight's *Burke*, ii ch. xx.; and the usual general historians. — Ed.]

ing the unruly and defiant spirit which had become dominant in Boston. On March 7 the King, in addressing Parliament, accused the Americans of attempting to injure British commerce and to subvert its constitution. The message was accompanied with a mass of papers and letters.[1] Lord North demanded additional powers in order to re-establish peace. The question at issue, it was said, was whether the colonies were or were not the colonies of Great Britain. If they were, they should be held firmly; if they were not, they should be released. Upon this question there was, just at this time, great unanimity in England. The authority of the Crown, it was urged, must be maintained at all hazards. Any act in violation of that must be punished. Even the party in opposition yielded much upon this point. Thus the ministry were fully prepared to introduce the most pronounced penal measures; and on the eighteenth, Lord North, disregarding constitutional forms, which forbid that any should be condemned unheard, brought in the famous Boston Port Bill, — a measure for suspending the trade and closing the harbor of Boston during the king's pleasure, and enforcing the act by the joint operations of an army and a fleet.[2] The bill was stoutly opposed by Burke, Barré, Dowdeswell, Pownall, and others; but in two weeks it passed through the various stages and was carried without a division in the Commons, and unanimously in the Lords, and became a law March 31 by the royal assent. This act was to go into effect on the first day of June. It took away from Boston the privilege of landing and discharging, as well as of loading and shipping, all goods, wares, and merchandise.[3] It constituted Marblehead a port of entry, and Salem the seat of government. As if this were not enough, Lord North now brought in within a month a series of measures, compared with which all that had gone before was mild and legitimate. The ministry seemed determined to wreak their vengeance upon the devoted head of Massachusetts; and nothing was too arbitrary, radical, or revolutionary for them to recommend. Up to this point there might have been a way of reconciliation. The cruel and exasperating Port Bill would probably have been withdrawn upon certain easy and perhaps reasonable conditions. The tea-tax and its preamble, which gave such offence to the colonists, might have been repealed; indeed an attempt to do so was made on April 19, when Edmund Burke made his ever memorable speech.[4] But when the penal

[1] These letters were from Hutchinson and other royal governors, and from Admiral Montagu and the consignees of the tea, accompanied by a large number of pamphlets, manifestoes, handbills, etc., issued in the colonies. [The king and council had already, Feb. 7, 1774, considered the petition of the House of Representatives for the removal of Hutchinson and Oliver, and had dismissed the charges "as groundless, vexatious, and scandalous, and calculated only for the seditious purpose of keeping up a spirit of clamour and discontent." The official copy sent to Arthur Lee, No. 3 Garden Court, Temple, is in the Lee Papers, University of Virginia. — Ed.]

[2] "The offence of the Americans," it was said in the course of the debate, "is flagitious. The town of Boston ought to be knocked about their ears and destroyed. *Delenda est Carthago.* You will never meet with proper obedience to the laws of this country until you have destroyed that nest of locusts." — *Mass. Gazette*, May 19, 1774.

[3] [See Sargent's *Dealings with the Dead*, i. 153. — Ed.]

[4] *Works*, Boston, 1865, vol. ii. p. 1.

measures, commonly known as the Regulation or Reconstructive Acts, were passed, a fatal blow was struck at the American system of local self-government, and the conflict was beyond recall.

These acts, which passed in rapid succession during the month of April, were for the purpose of "regulating the government of the Province of Massachusetts Bay."[1] The speech of Lord George Germain, on the introduction of the bill, shows how sadly ignorance concerning America, and contempt for her institutions, had pervaded England at this time. Speaking of North's plan to punish the people of Massachusetts, he said: —

"Nor can I think he will do a better thing than to put an end to their town-meetings. I would not have men of a mercantile cast every day collecting themselves together and debating about political matters. I would have them follow their occupations as merchants, and not consider themselves as ministers of that country. . . . I would wish to see the Council in that country similar to the House of Lords in this. . . . The whole are the proceedings of a tumultuous and riotous rabble, who ought, if they had the least prudence, to follow their mercantile employments, and not trouble themselves with politics and government which they do not understand."

When he had finished this remarkable speech, Lord North arose and said: "I thank the noble lord for every proposition he has held out. They are worthy of a great mind, and such as ought to be adopted."[2]

For the purpose of strengthening the executive authority, these Regulation Acts, without giving any hearing to the Province, provided, —

1. In total violation of the charter, that the councillors who had been chosen hitherto by the Legislature should be appointed by the king, and hold at his pleasure. The superior judges were to hold at the will of the king, and be dependent upon him for their salaries; and the inferior judges were to be removable at the discretion of the royal governor. The sheriffs were to be appointed and removed by the executive; and the juries were to be selected by the dependent sheriffs. Town-meetings were to be abolished, except for the election of officers, or by the special permission of the Governor. This bill passed by a vote of more than three to one.

2. Magistrates, revenue officers, and soldiers, charged with capital offences, could be tried in England or Nova Scotia. This bill passed by a vote of more than four to one.

3. A military act provided for the quartering of troops upon the towns.[3]

These oppressive edicts, said the Massachusetts committee in their circular, were only what might have been expected from a Parliament claiming[4] the right to make laws binding the colonies "in all cases whatsoever."

[1] [The debates are given in 4 *Force's American Archives*, i. — Ed.]

[2] *Parliamentary History*, xvii. pp. 1192–1195. Also Boston newspapers of May 19 and 23, 1774.

[3] *Boston Post-Boy*, June 6 and 13, 1774. Gordon, *American Revolution*, i. 232–235. Mahon, *History of England*, vi. 5, 6. Bancroft, vi. 525, 526. Frothingham, *Rise of the Republic*, pp. 345–347. Dana, *Oration at Lexington*, April 19, 1875.

[4] In the declaratory act. See earlier in this chapter.

The news of the Port Act created, as may well be supposed, the greatest indignation in the colonies; but Boston stood firm, and the other seaports refused to profit by her patriotic sufferings.

In May Hutchinson was recalled, to the great relief of the people of the province; and Thomas Gage, Commander-in-chief of the continent, was appointed also Governor of Massachusetts. In all the political agitations in the colonies thus far, Gage had behaved so discreetly as an officer that he enjoyed a considerable share of public confidence. After a lengthy interview with his predecessor at Castle William, he landed at Long Wharf, on May 17, saluted by the ships and batteries, and received by the civil officers of the province. The cadets, under Colonel Hancock, performed escort duty, and the council presented a loyal address at the State House.[1] A public dinner followed at Faneuil Hall.[2] Undoubtedly this welcome given to Gage was owing, in part, to the delight of the people at the retirement of Hutchinson.[3] But it soon appeared that the new Governor, with many excellent traits, was not the man to reconcile or to subdue, if indeed any such man could have been found in the whole British service at this critical moment. It devolved upon Gage to close the port of Boston and to enforce the measures of the odious Regulation Acts. The blockade of the harbor began on the first day of June, after which all intercourse by water, even among the nearest islands or from pier to pier, was rigidly forbidden. Not a ferry could ply to Charlestown, nor a scow to Dorchester. Warehouses were at once useless, wharves deserted, and ordinary business prostrated. All classes felt the scourge of the oppressor; yet there was no regret at the position which the town had deliberately taken in defence of its constitutional rights. These were dearer to the inhabitants than property or peace or even life itself, as was shortly to be proved. Expressions of sympathy poured in from all quarters. Supplies of food and money were generously sent from the other colonies as well as from the neighboring towns.[4] Salem and Marblehead scorned to profit

[1] ["The Town House is fitted up in the most elegant manner, with the whole of the outside painted of a stone color, which gives it a fine appearance."— June, 1773, in *Mass. Hist. Soc. Proc.*, July, 1865, p. 324. Hancock had the previous March, 1774, delivered the usual Massacre oration, which in the opinion of some was written by Samuel Adams. *John Adams's Works*, ii. 332; Wells's *S. Adams*. — Ed.]

[2] [Gage at this "elegant entertainment gave 'Governor Hutchinson' as a toast, which was received by a general hiss."— *Mass. Hist. Soc. Proc.*, 1865, p. 328. — Ed.]

[3] [The friends of Hutchinson and the prerogative made themselves conspicuous by an address on his leaving the province, and a list of the "addressers" is given in *Mass. Hist. Soc. Proc.*, October, 1870. — Ed.]

[4] [There are at the City Hall various lists of donations received at this time, with the records of the donation committee. See Vol I. p. xx. The correspondence of this committee is in 4 *Mass. Hist. Coll.*, iv. Colonel A. H. Hoyt has given an account of these gifts in the *N. E. Hist. and Geneal. Reg.*, July, 1876. A subscription-list of contributions raised in Virginia in 1774, for the "distressed inhabitants of Boston," is printed in the *Mass. Hist. Soc. Proc.*, December, 1857. When the Marbleheaders sent in provisions for the Boston poor, they were refused passage for them by water, and an expensive land-carriage of twenty-eight miles was rendered necessary, as even a ferry passage was refused. *Mass. Hist. Soc. Proc.*, 1865, p. 336. Benefactors in South Carolina and Connecticut were equally compelled to pay for a land passage. — Ed.]

by the sufferings of Boston, and offered the free use of their wharves and stores.[1]

The committee of correspondence assumed with much ability the arduous and responsible task of guiding public affairs at this crisis. "A solemn league and covenant" to suspend all commercial intercourse with England, and forego the use of all British merchandise, was forwarded to every town in the province; and the names of those who refused to sign it were to be published. The first act of the Legislature at Salem was to protest against the illegal order for its removal. The House of Representatives was the fullest ever known in the country, one hundred and twenty-nine being present. It was for them to fix the time and place for the proposed meeting of the Continental Congress, for which Samuel Adams and his coadjutors were diligently laboring.[2] While they were sitting with closed doors a message came from the Governor dissolving the Assembly, but not until its important work had been done.[3] Baffled in his purposes and chagrined at the success of the Patriots, Gage, without consulting the council, issued his foolish and malignant proclamation against the combination not to purchase British goods. He denounced it as "unwarrantable, hostile, and traitorous;" its subscribers as "open and declared enemies of the King and Parliament;" and he "enjoined and commanded all magistrates and other officers . . . to apprehend and secure for trial all persons who might publish or sign, or invite others to sign, the covenant." It was known that the Governor was endeavoring to fasten charges of rebellion upon several of the popular leaders, in order to secure their arrest; but his plans did not succeed.

In August the Regulation Acts were officially received by Gage and immediately put into effect, sweeping away the long cherished Charter of Massachusetts, and precipitating the irreversible choice between submission and resistance. Samuel Adams wrote:[4] —

"Boston suffers with dignity. If Britain by her multiplied oppressions accelerates the independency of her colonies, whom will she have to blame but herself? It is

[1] [In 1774 John Kneeland printed at Boston a part of Thomas Prince's sermon on the destruction of D'Anville's fleet in 1746, "with a view to encourage and animate the people of God to put their trust in him, under the severe and keen distresses now taking place, by the rigorous execution of the Port Bill." Ellis Gray, writing from Boston at this time to a friend in Jamaica, somewhat drolly apologizes for his slack correspondence on the ground that he lived "seventeen miles from a sea-port," — referring to Salem and Marblehead. See *Mass. Hist. Soc. Proc.*, March, 1876, p. 315. The *Royal Amer. Mag.*, June, 1774, has one of Revere's satires on the Port Bill, in "The Able Doctor, or America swallowing the bitter Draught." The same magazine for May contains the act for blockading the port of Boston. An expression of the prevailing feeling is found in Andrews's letters. *Mass. Hist. Soc. Proc.*, 1865, p. 327. — Ed.]

[2] [C. M. Endicott's *Leslie's Retreat*, p. 9. — Ed.]

[3] The Congress was appointed to meet in September, at Philadelphia, and the Massachusetts delegates were Bowdoin (who, however, could not attend), Samuel Adams, John Adams, Cushing, and Robert Treat Paine. [This Congress sat in Philadelphia from September 5 to October 26. The idea of it is said to have originated with Franklin. Its proceedings, issued in Philadelphia, were at once reprinted in Boston. Numerous references are given in Winsor's *Handbook*, pp. 16–19. — Ed.]

[4] Letters to William Checkley and Charles Thomson, June 1 and 2, 1774

a consolatory thought that an empire is rising in America. . . . Our people think they should pursue the line of the Constitution as far as they can; and if they are driven from it they can with propriety and justice appeal to God and to the world. . . . Nothing is more foreign to our hearts than a spirit of rebellion. Would to God they all, even our enemies, knew the warm attachment we have for Great Britain, notwithstanding we have been contending these ten years with them for our rights!"

That attachment was ruthlessly severed by the operation of the new acts. "We were not the revolutionists," says Mr. Dana.[1] "The King and Parliament were the revolutionists. They were the radical innovators. We were the conservators of existing institutions. They were seeking to overthrow and reconstruct on a theory of parliamentary omnipotence. . . . We broke no chain."

Boston was now occupied by a large military force. The Fourth, Fifth, Thirty-eighth, and Forty-third regiments, together with twenty-two pieces of cannon and three companies of artillery, were encamped on the Common.[2] The Welsh Fusileers were encamped on Fort Hill, and several companies of the Sixty-fourth were at Castle William, where most of the powder and other stores had been removed from New York. The Fifty-ninth was encamped at Salem, to protect the meetings of the new mandamus council; and two companies of the Sixty-fourth were at Danvers, to cover the Governor's residence.[3] The camp at Boston was, in the absence of Gage, under command of Earl Percy, who had recently arrived with Colonels Pigott and Jones. Lord Percy describes the situation with some minuteness in his letters written to friends in England at this time:[4] —

"The people, by all accounts, are extremely violent and wrong-headed; so much so that I fear we shall be obliged to come to extremities." "One thing I will be bold

[1] *Oration at Lexington*, April 19, 1875.

[2] [We get a glimpse of the British camp at this time in the privately printed *Memoir and Letters of Captain W. Glanville Evelyn of the Fourth Regiment* ("*King's Own*"), which was printed in 1879 at Oxford, edited by G. D. Scull. This officer joined his regiment in June, 1774, and wrote home sundry letters here preserved, in which the provincials appear as "rascals and poltroons." In December he was quartered in a house, and, having "laid in a good stock of Port and Madeira, hoped to spend the winter as well as our neighbors." He speaks of Sam Adams "as moving and directing this immense continent, — a man of ordinary birth and desperate fortune, who, by his abilities and talent for factious intrigue, has made himself of some consequence; whose political existence depends upon the continuance of the present dispute, and who must sink into insignificancy and beggary the moment it ceases" (p. 46). "Hancock is a poor contemptible fool, led about by Adams." Dr. Holmes draws the picture of the Common at this time: —

"And over all the open green
Where grazed of late the harmless kine,
The cannon's deepening ruts are seen,
The war-horse stamps, the bayonets shine."

John Andrews, writing of the delegation to the Congress of September, 1774, says: "Robert Treat Paine set out with the committee this morning [Aug. 10]. They made a very respectable parade in sight of five of the regiments encamped on the Common; being in a coach and four, preceded by two white servants well mounted and armed, with four blacks behind in livery, two on horseback and two footmen." — *Mass. Hist. Soc. Proc.*, July, 1865, p. 339. — Ed.]

[3] [Here, at the country residence of Robert Hooper, "King Hooper" of Marblehead, Gage had his headquarters for a while, Salem being then, under the Port Bill, the capital. On Aug. 27, 1774, Gage left Danvers and moved his headquarters to Boston, and the Fifty-ninth and Sixty-fourth regiments soon followed him, the former taking post on Boston Neck to throw up entrenchments there. — Ed.]

[4] Private letters in possession of his Grace the Duke of Northumberland, and copied, by

to say, which is, that till you make their committees of correspondence and congresses with the other colonies high treason, and try them for it in England, you never must expect perfect obedience from this to the mother country." "This is the most beautiful country I ever saw in my life, and if the people were only like it we should do very well. Everything, however, is as yet quiet, but they threaten much. Not that I believe they dare act." "We have at last got the new acts, and twenty-six of the new council have accepted and are sworn in; but for my own part, I doubt whether they will be more active than the old ones. Such a set of timid creatures I never did see. Those of the new council that live at any distance from town have remained here ever since they took the oaths, and are, I am told, afraid to go home again. As for the opposite party, they are arming and exercising all over the country. . . . Their method of eluding that part of the act which relates to the town-meetings is strongly characteristic of the people. They say that since the town-meetings are forbid by the act, they shall not hold them; but as they do not see any mention made of county meetings, they shall hold them for the future. They therefore go a mile out of town, do just the same business there they formerly did in Boston, call it a county meeting, and so elude the act.[1] In short, I am certain that it will require a great length of time, much steadiness, and many troops, to re-establish good order and government. I plainly foresee that there is not a new councillor or magistrate who will dare to act without at least a regiment at his heels; and it is not quite clear to me that he will even act then as he ought to do." "The delegates from this province are set out (August 21) to meet the General Congress at Philadelphia. They talk much of non-importation, and an agreement between the colonies. . . . I flatter myself, however, that instead of agreeing to anything, they will all go by the ears together at this Congress. If they don't, there will be more work cut out for administration in America than perhaps they are aware of."

It soon appeared that the new acts were powerless to accomplish the end contemplated by the Government. With all the support furnished by a royal governor, royal judges, and a royal army, the courts could not sit, jurors would not serve, and the people would not obey. Sheriffs were timid, councillors resigned their places and soldiers deserted. Meanwhile the colonists were busy, maturing their plans in clubs, caucuses, and conventions. Whether these were legal or illegal under the new act, they did not stop to inquire.

permission, by the present writer. Hugh Earl Percy was born August 25, 1742. In early life he adopted the military profession, and served under Prince Ferdinand of Brunswick in the Seven Years' War. He arrived in Boston July 5, 1774, with the Fifth Regiment of foot, and remained in the service in this country until May 3, 1777, when he returned to England with the rank of lieut.-general in North America. He was especially prominent at Lexington, and in the attack on Fort Washington, at King's Bridge. Soon after his return to England, he was selected to head a commission to offer terms of conciliation to Congress; but, owing to a division in the British Cabinet, Lord Percy declined the offer, and the project was abandoned. After this, he represented the city of Westminster in Parliament until the year 1786, when he succeeded his father as Duke of Northumberland. For many years his time was chiefly employed in improving his princely estates. During the war with France, he raised from among his tenantry a corps of fifteen hundred men, called the "Percy Yeomanry," the whole corps being paid, clothed, and maintained by himself. He was a Knight of the Garter, a member of several learned societies, and the recipient of many of the highest honors of the realm. He died at Northumberland House, London, July 10, 1817, in the seventy-fifth year of his age, and was buried in St. Nicholas Chapel, Westminster Abbey.

[1] [This explains the somewhat strange appellation of the "Suffolk Resolves," mentioned later in the text. Ed.]



Sir
Your humble Serv.t
Percy.
Apl 20th 1775 Boston[1]

No act of Parliament, they maintained, could impose restrictions upon those ancient and chartered rights which they had always enjoyed. With this

[1] This cut follows an engraving by V. Green, executed in London, in 1777, and measuring 18 × 12½ inches. The plate was engraved from a portrait presented by the Duke of Northumberland, July 30, 1776, to the magistrates of Westminster, and placed in the council chamber of

conviction they had resisted the injustice of the Stamp Act and the Tea Act, and they were not the men to yield now to a tyranny far greater than either.

THE WARREN HOUSE IN ROXBURY.[1]

The Regulating Act had not been long in operation before the popular resistance which it encountered found appropriate expression in the famous Suffolk Resolves drawn up by Warren, who acted as a kind of director-general during the absence of Samuel Adams at Philadelphia. These resolves,

their Guild Hall in commemoration of Lord Percy's public services. The portrait was evidently a duplicate of the one by Pompeio Battoni, now at Alnwick Castle, a copy of which was made in 1879 by order of the present Duke and presented, through the writer of this chapter, to the Town of Lexington. Another likeness of Earl Percy, taken later in life, may be seen with a brief account in Captain Evelyn's *Memoir and Letters*, p. 127

[1] [This cut follows a painting now owned by the wife of Dr. Buckminster Brown, of Boston, a descendant of General Warren. The house was built in 1720 by Joseph Warren, the General's grandfather. It was used as quarters for Colonel David Brewer's regiment during the summer of 1775. The late Dr. John C. Warren acquired the estate in 1805; and selling off all but the house in 1833, he built, in 1846, the present stone cottage on the site. (*Life of Dr. John Warren*, ch. i.) In the old house (of which another view, as well as one of the present cottage, is given in Drake's *Town of Roxbury*, p. 213) Joseph Warren was born, in 1741; but at this time he lived on Hanover Street, where the American House now stands, hiring the mansion house of Joseph Green, which stood there. *Mass. Hist. Soc. Proc.*, 1875, p. 101. Ellis Ames, Esq., has parts of Warren's day-book between January, 1771, and January, 1775, showing the extent of his medical practice. Frothingham, *Life of Warren*, p. 167. — ED.]

nineteen in number,[1] were adopted in September by the Suffolk convention, which met first at Dedham,[2] and then, by adjournment, at Milton.[3] They

In Committee of Safety Cambridge May 14. 1775

Jos Warren Ch

declared that the sovereign who breaks his compact with his subjects forfeits their allegiance. They arraigned the unconstitutional acts of Parliament,

[1] Given in Frothingham's *Warren*, pp. 365–367, and Appendix i.

[2] At the house of Richard Woodward.

[3] At the house of Daniel Vose.

[4] [This cut follows a painting by Copley, now in the possession of Dr. Buckminster Brown, of Boston, who kindly allowed it to be photographed for the engraver's use. Perkins, in his *Copley's Life and Paintings*, p. 115, says: "The canvas is about five feet long by four wide, and the color-

and rejected all officers appointed under their authority. They directed collectors of taxes to pay over no money to the royal treasurer. They advised the towns to choose their officers of militia from the friends of the people. They favored a Provincial Congress, and promised respect and submission to the Continental Congress. They determined to act upon the defensive as long as reason and self-preservation would permit, "but no longer." They threatened to seize every Crown officer in the province as hostages if the Governor should arrest any one for political reasons. They

ing is very beautiful. It was one of Copley's last portraits before he left Boston for Europe in 1774, and as a piece of artistic skill, as well as for its historic interest, has been pronounced by good judges to be one of the most valuable of Copley's portraits in this country. It was painted while General Warren was the presiding officer of the Massachusetts Congress." The sitter and the artist were intimate friends, and the portrait was painted for General Warren's children, and has always been in the possession of some branch of the family. This portrait, with that of Mrs. Warren, by the same artist, was loaned to Mr. W. W. Corcoran for exhibition in his gallery at Washington, D. C. There is extant a letter from Lord Lyndhurst in which he makes inquiries respecting it, in reference, it is supposed, to the possibility of securing it for an English collection. These paintings have been in Boston since the spring of 1876, and have never before been reproduced. That of Mrs. Warren, of the same size, was probably painted three or four years previously. She died in 1773, at the age of twenty-six.

The familiar engraved likeness of General Warren, following another Copley, 29 x 24 inches, in citizen's dress, showing one hand, was originally owned by General Arnold Welles who married Warren's daughter, from whom it passed to the late Dr. John C. Warren, and is now owned by his grandson of the same name. Another half-length by Copley, belonging to the city, is now in the Art Museum. Early engravings of Warren are to be found in the *Impartial History of the War*, Boston edition (engraved by J. Norman, full-length, and showing the battle of Bunker Hill in the background), and in the *Boston Magazine*, May, 1784, following Copley's picture and engraved by J. Norman. A colored engraving resembling Copley's likeness was also frequently seen, and a copy is now preserved in the pavilion on Bunker Hill. A portrait statue, based on Copley's likeness, and executed by Henry Dexter, was erected in this pavilion in 1857, when dedicatory services took place on the anniversary of the battle, with an address by Edward Everett. An engraving of the statue is given in the commemorative volume which was issued at the time by the Bunker Hill Monument Association. See also George Washington Warren's *History of the Bunker Hill Monument Association*.

General Warren left four children, two sons and two daughters. The sons died in early manhood. One daughter married General Arnold Welles, of Boston, and died without children. The second daughter was twice married: first to Mr. Lyman, of Northampton, and second to Judge Newcomb, of Greenfield, Mass. This daughter died in 1826, leaving one son, Joseph Warren Newcomb, who had two children, a son and daughter. The descendants of General Warren now living are a great-granddaughter, who is married and lives in Boston, and a great-great-grandson, who is a cadet at West Point.

A sumptuous volume, *Genealogy of Warren*, by Dr. John C. Warren, was printed in Boston, in 1854, to show the connections of the Patriot both in this country and presumably and possibly in England. For an account of the papers of General Warren, see *Life of John C. Warren*, i. 217. One of Pendleton's earliest lithographs was of Warren's portrait, which appeared with a memoir in the *Boston Monthly Magazine*, June, 1826.

Abigail Adams repeats a story of an intended indignity to the body of Warren after his fall at Bunker Hill, from which he was saved by his Freemasonry affiliations. (*Familiar Letters*, p. 91.) On the repossession of Boston after the siege, the body was exhumed from the spot where he fell; and after an oration pronounced over it by Perez Morton (which was printed and is quoted in Loring's *Hundred Boston Orators*, p. 127*), it was deposited in the Minot tomb in the Granary Burying-ground; and in 1825 was removed to a tomb beneath St. Paul's, whence, at a later day, the remains were again removed to Forest Hills cemetery. Shurtleff's *Description of Boston*, p. 251. See an account of some relics of Warren by J. S. Loring in the *Hist. Mag.*, December, 1857. His sword is in the possession of Dr. John Collins Warren. *Mass. Hist. Soc. Proc.*, September, 1866, p. 348. — ED.]

* Also reprinted in a *Biographical Sketch of General Joseph Warren, embracing his Boston Orations of 1772 and 1775; together with the Eulogy pronounced by Perez Morton, in 1797.* By a Bostonian. *Boston*: 1857.

also arranged a system of couriers to carry messages to town officers and corresponding committees. They earnestly advocated the well known American principles of social order as the basis of all political action; exhorted all persons to abstain from riots and all attacks upon the property of any person whatsoever; and urged their countrymen to convince their "enemies that in a contest so important, in a cause so solemn, their conduct should be such as to merit the approbation of the wise, and the admiration of the brave and free of every age and of every country." For boldness and practical utility these resolves surpassed anything that had been promulgated in America. They were sent by Paul Revere as a memorial to the Congress at Philadelphia, where they were received with great applause, and recommended to the whole country.

Gage, perceiving that the time for reasoning had passed, applied[1] for more troops, seized the powder belonging to the Province,[2] and began the construction of fortifications on the Neck, near the Roxbury line, commanding the only land entrance which Boston had.[3] Beyond the limits of Boston

[1] [Correspondence of Gage at this time with Lord Dartmouth is in the *Mass. Hist. Soc. Proc.*, 1876, p. 347. See also *Life of Lord Barrington.* — Ed.]

[2] [On September 1, 1774, Gage sent 260 soldiers, who embarked in boats at Long Wharf, to seize the Province's store of powder, which was kept in the old mill on the road from Winter Hill to Arlington. William Brattle, at that time commanding the Province militia, had instigated the movement. It was successful, and the troops returned bringing not only the powder, but two field-pieces which they had seized in Cambridge. This theft was soon avenged. An artillery company had been organized by Capt. David Mason in 1763, and was known commonly as "the train," and attached to the Boston regiment. Its command had passed in 1768 to Lieutenant Adino Paddock, who was a good drill master, and who



derived instruction himself from members of a company of royal artillery stationed at the Castle; and the train became the school of many good officers of the Revolution. Paddock received two light brass field-pieces, and uniformed a number of German emigrants in white frocks, hair caps, and broadswords, to drag the cannon. These pieces had, it is supposed, been cast in London for the Province from some old cannon sent over for the purpose, and they bore the Province arms. They seem to have been first used when the king's birthday was celebrated, June 4, 1768, in firing a salute, when the train paraded with Colonel Phips's governor's troop and Colonel Jackson's regiment. At the outbreak of the war these pieces were kept in a gun-house at the corner of West Street; and as Paddock adhered to the royal cause, and might surrender them to Gage, they were stealthily removed by some young Patriots and, on a good opportunity, conveyed by boat to the American camp, where they did good service then and through the war; and in 1788 Knox, then secretary of war, had them inscribed with the names of Hancock and Adams, and they now may be seen in the summit-chamber of Bunker Hill Monument. (Drake's *Knox*, p. 127.) The young men who accomplished their removal were, among others, Abraham Holbrook, Nathaniel Balch, Samuel Gore, Moses Grant, and Jeremy Gridley. (Tudor's *Life of Otis*, p. 452.) Judge Story's father was another. (*Life and Letters of Judge Story*, i. 9. See also *N. E. Hist. and Geneal. Reg.* vii. 139.) The committee of safety, Feb. 23, 1775, instructed Dr. Warren to ascertain what number of Paddock's men could be depended on. Drake, *Cincinnati Society*, p. 543, gives a partial list of the train-members, designating such as subsequently served in the Patriot army. Paddock left Boston with Gage, and died in the Isle of Jersey in 1804, aged seventy-six. Mills and Hicks's *Register*, 1775, gives a statement of the Boston military at this time. See Frothingham's *Siege of Boston*, p. 49. — Ed.]

[3] [Andrews records, Sept. 5, 1774, that Gage began to build block-houses and otherwise repair the fortifications at the Neck, but he could get none of the artisans of the town to help him. Three days later Gage, "with a large parade of

and Salem the Governor had scarcely any power. The people of the interior counties recognized only the authority of the committees of correspondence, and of the congresses composed of their own representatives.

On the fifth of October, the members of the Massachusetts Assembly appeared at the court-house in Salem, but were refused recognition by

MRS. JOSEPH WARREN.[1]

Gage; thereupon they resolved themselves into a Provincial Congress and adjourned to Concord, where, on the eleventh, two hundred and sixty members, representing over two hundred towns, took their seats, and elected

attendants," surveyed the skirts of the town opposite the country shore, supposably for determining on sites of batteries. See an editorial note to the chapter following this. In November, 1774, Nathaniel Appleton writes to Josiah Quincy, Jr.: "The main guard is kept at George Erving's warehouse in King Street The new-erected fortifications on the Neck are laughed at by our old Louisburg soldiers as mud walls." *Life of Josiah Quincy, Jr.*, p. 175. — Ed.]

[1] [She died in 1773, aged 26 The *Boston Gazette* of May 3 published some commemorative verses on her. Frothingham's *Warren*, p. 228. This painting is the pendant of that of General Warren, and the two have always been owned together. — Ed.]

John Hancock president, and Benjamin Lincoln secretary. They sent a message to the Governor, remonstrating against his hostile attitude. He answered by making recriminations; and shortly after issued a proclamation denouncing them as "an unlawful assembly whose proceedings tended to ensnare the inhabitants of the Province, and draw them into perjuries, riots, sedition, treason, and rebellion." The Congress, having adjourned to Cambridge, adopted a series of resolves providing for the creation of a "committee of public safety,"[1] — a sort of directory empowered to organize the militia and to procure military stores.[2] A committee of supplies was also appointed, and three general officers — Preble, Ward, and Pomeroy — were chosen by ballot. Thus the people of Massachusetts proceeded in a calm and statesmanlike manner to organize themselves into an independent existence, and to make suitable provision for their own political, financial, and military necessities. They had no intention of attacking the British troops, but took measures to defend themselves in case of necessity.[3] Hitherto they had carefully avoided being the aggressors, and they were determined to adhere to this policy; but they considered it the part of wisdom to be prepared for any emergency which might arise in the present complicated state of affairs. Consequently, all the towns were advised to enroll companies of Minute Men, who should be thoroughly drilled and equipped.[4]





Gage also on his part was actively employed in strengthening the garrison, and by the end of the year he had no less than eleven regiments, with artillery and marines, quartered in Boston, besides a large number of ships of war at anchor in the harbor. During all this time the Tory party was endeavoring, without much success, to secure adherents to the royal cause.[5] Most of their leaders, finding their position uncomfortable in the

[1] Hancock, Warren, and Church were the Boston members.

[2] [Mr. C. C. Smith contributed a valuable paper on "The Manufacture of Gunpowder in America," to *Mass. Hist. Soc. Proc.*, March, 1876. — Ed.]

[3] [It was at the Green Dragon Tavern, which stood on what now makes Union Street, near where it runs into Haymarket Square (there is a doubt whether the building now marked with a dragon on a tablet gives correctly the site), and whose earlier history is noted in Vol. II, Introduction, p. v, that the leading Patriots held their conclaves. It was in front a two-story brick building with a pitch roof, but of greater elevation in the rear; and over the entrance an iron rod projected, and upon it was crouched the copper dragon which was the tavern's sign. It was probably selected as a meeting place because Warren was the Grand Master of the Grand Lodge of Masons, who had their quarters here. Paul Revere records how he was one of upwards of thirty men, chiefly mechanics, who banded together to keep watch on the British designs in 1774-75, and met here. The old building disappeared in October, 1828, when the street was widened to accommodate the travel to Charlestown. Shurtleff, *Description of Boston*, p. 605. — Ed.]

[4] [The last monthly meeting of the Friends was held in Boston in the eleventh month of 1774. "The record speaks of its being a time of difficulty in Boston on account of the present calamity [the war]; and the same likely to attend them through the winter, Boston monthly meeting is dropped." — *An Historical Account of the various Meeting-houses of the Society of Friends in Boston*, published by direction of the Yearly Meeting, Boston, 1874. — Ed.]

[5] See Sabine's *Loyalists*.

country towns, took refuge in Boston as a kind of asylum. Their organs denounced the Patriots as rebels, rioters, republicans, and sowers of sedition.

At the beginning of the year 1775 the American question was brought forward in the House of Lords by the Earl of Chatham, who, in one of his most eloquent speeches, urged the immediate removal of the king's troops from Boston. He eulogized the American people, their union, their spirit of liberty, and the wisdom which marked the proceedings of their Congress.[1] He charged the ministry with misleading the king and alienating the affections of his subjects. Chatham was ably supported by Shelburne, Camden, and Rockingham; but all their appeals "availed no more than the whistling of the wind." The motion was rejected by nearly four to one. This result, following as it did the rejection by the Cabinet of the petition of Congress which Franklin had just presented, was sufficient proof that nothing was to be hoped for from that quarter. If any further evidence was wanted, it was soon found in the instructions which were sent to Gage to act offensively, and in the Restraining Act, which excluded New England from the fisheries.[2]

While England was thus forcing on the issue, America was preparing to meet it. The new Congress convened at Cambridge in February, and appointed its committee of safety and the delegates to the next Continental Congress. Provision was also made for the militia; and Colonels Thomas





and Heath were commissioned additional general officers. "Resistance to tyranny!" was now the watchword for Massachusetts. "Life and liberty shall go together! Continue steadfast!" said the Patriots; "and with a proper sense of your dependence on God, nobly defend those rights which Heaven gave and no man ought to take from us."[3]

[1] [See the *History of Lord North's Administration*, p. 187; Hugh Boyd's *Miscellaneous Works*, i. 196; *Annual Register*, 1775, p. 47; Belsham's *Great Britain*, vi. 91; *Life of Josiah, Quincy, Jr.*, p. 318. — Ed.]

[2] [See various references for political movements in England at this time in Winsor's *Handbook*, p. 23, etc. — Ed.]

[3] [In March came the anniversary of the massacre, and Warren's most famous address in commemoration. See Mr. Goddard's chapter. The diary of Joshua Green, making note of it, speaks of the attempts of British officers present at the town-meeting which followed, to break it up by unseemly disturbances. (*Mass. Hist. Soc. Proc.*, 1875, p. 101.) About this time (March 22, 1775), according to statements printed in a Boston letter in the *New York Journal*, a number of drunken British officers set to hacking the fence before Hancock's house; and on a repetition of such annoyances, Hancock applied for a guard. While the congregation of the West Church were observing a fast, drums and fifes were played by another party close under the windows. Something of the feeling of the time can be gathered from letters of Quincy, Cooper, Winthrop, and Warren, printed in *Massachusetts Historical Society's Proceedings*, June, 1863, — all addressed to Benjamin Franklin in London. — Ed.]

Gage did his utmost to disarm and disperse the militia and seize their military stores. He sent expeditions to Marshfield and Jamaica Plain and Salem;[1] but the judicious and spirited conduct of the inhabitants defeated his object, and the peace was not then disturbed. For a time it was quiet, but it was only the lull before the storm; and the hour of the American Revolution, which had been so long in coming, was near at hand. The War of Independence on this continent began[2] at last on that memorable morning, enshrined forever in the annals of freedom, when

"The troops were hastening from the town
To hold the country for the Crown:
But through the land the ready thrill
Of patriot hearts ran swifter still.

"The winter's wheat was in the ground,
Waiting the April zephyr's sound:
But other growth these fields should bear
When war's wild summons rent the air."

Edward G. Porter

[1] [The expedition to Salem was sent by Gage in transport from the Castle, and its three hundred troops, landing at Marblehead, marched to Salem to seize some cannon. Their failure and retreat is described in Charles M. Endicott's *Leslie's Retreat at the North Bridge, Feb.* 26, 1775, printed separately for vol. i. of the *Essex Institute Proceedings*. See also *Life of Timothy Pickering*. i., and George B. Loring's *Address* on the centennial observance of the event. The contemporary accounts of the Marshfield expedition are in Force's *American Archives*. Of another and more secret expedition just now, that of Captain Brown and his companion De Bernière, sent by Gage inland toward Worcester to pick up information, we have their own account, printed in the *American Archives*, i. Gage's instructions to these emissaries, Feb. 22, 1775, were printed in Boston in a pamphlet in 1779, which also contains "The Transactions of the British troops previous to and at the Battle of Lexington," as reported to Gage. — Ed.]

[2] [Various claims have been made for earlier shedding of blood and resistance in arms, like the capture of the fort at Great Island, near Portsmouth, Dec. 13, 1774. — see *American Archives*, Belknap's *New Hampshire*, Amory's *General Sullivan* and *Governor Sullivan*. *Mass. Hist. Soc. Proc.*, March, 1875; or the Golden Hill affair, Jan. 19, 1770, near New York, — see *Hist. Mag.*, iv. 233, and again January, 1869; or the Westminster massacre, March, 1775, in Vermont, — see *Hist. Mag.*, May, 1859; see also *Potter's American Monthly*, April, 1875. — Ed.]

CHAPTER II.

THE SIEGE OF BOSTON.

BY THE REV. EDWARD E. HALE, D.D.

AFTER dark on the 18th of April, 1775, eight hundred British troops, being the grenadiers and light infantry of Gage's army, were withdrawn as quietly as might be from their barracks and marched to the bay at the foot of the Common. The spot is near where the station of the Providence Railroad now stands.[1] Boats from the squadron had been ordered to the same point to meet them. The troops were under the command of Lieut.-Colonel Francis Smith, of the Tenth regiment. Directly northward, crossing by about the line of Arlington Street what are now the Commonwealth Avenue and Beacon Street, the little army came to Phips's Farm, now East Cambridge, and after two hours took up its silent march through Cambridge to Lexington and Concord. The column consisted of men drawn from the Fifth regiment, the Tenth, Thirty-eighth, Forty-third, Fifty-second, Fifty-ninth, and Sixty-fifth. Officers and men from each of these corps appeared in the list of killed and wounded after the next day. In some instances they may have been detached on separate service; in which case no large number of the regiment was present on the march.[2]

What happened at Concord, and on the way thither and back, has worked its way into the world's history. "On the nineteenth of April," says the memorial of the Provincial Congress, "a day to be remembered by all Americans of the present generation, and which ought and doubtless will be handed down to ages yet unborn, the troops of Britain, unprovoked, shed the blood of sundry of the loyal American subjects of the British King in the field of Lexington."

The Common and the Back Bay were so far apart from the familiar haunts of men in those days, that General Gage had some hope, perhaps, of sending his men away without an immediate alarm.[3] But this hope was

[1] [Here was water enough for the boats (see map at beginning of Vol. I.), but Gage's account says simply "from the Common." Smith says nothing. The usual story runs simply "from the foot of the Common." — Ed.]

[2] [Donkin, *Military Collections*, p. 170, says they carried "72 rounds of ball-cartridges per man." — Ed.]

[3] [See the Editorial notes following this chapter. — Ed.]

disappointed. Thirty men of the Patriot party, mostly mechanics, had bound themselves into a club, to observe the movements of the Tories and the army. They took turns as patrols, two and two, to watch the streets at night. Some one, who was perhaps one of these men, told Dr. Warren that the soldiers were moving to the Back Bay. Warren immediately sent William Dawes to Lexington, whither John Hancock and Samuel Adams had retired to escape arrest, supposing that one object of the expedition was to seize them. Dawes started on horseback, crossing the Neck to Roxbury. At ten o'clock Warren sent to Paul Revere, who was one of the club of patrolmen, and begged him to go to Lexington and tell Hancock and Adams of the movement, "and that it was thought they were the objects." Paul Revere went to a friend who had a boat in readiness, and crossed at once to Charlestown. So early was Gage's secret known. Stedman, in his history of the war, says that Gage told Percy of the movement as a profound secret; that Colonel Smith knew he was to go, but not where. As Lord Percy returned to his own quarters, he fell in with eight or ten men talking on the Common. One of them said: "The troops have marched, but will miss their aim." "What aim?" said Lord Percy. "Why," the man replied, "the cannon at Concord." Lord Percy, according to the story, returned to General Gage and told him, with surprise and disapprobation, what he had heard. The General said that his confidence had been betrayed, for that he had communicated his design to only one person beside Lord Percy. This is one of the flings of the time upon Mrs. Gage,[1] who was American-born. The English officers who disliked Gage were fond of saying that she betrayed his secrets. But in this case, after eight hundred men were embarked for Cambridge, ten Boston men on the Common might well have known it; and "the cannon at Concord" were a very natural aim. Warren, as has been said, thought of Hancock and Adams as the object.[2]

Paul Revere had already concerted with his friends on the Charlestown side, that, in the event of any movement by night on the part of the Eng-

[1] [Adams had learned of the movement to Concord from "a daughter of liberty, unequally yoked in point of politics," as Gordon says. — Ed.]

[2] The following narrative, kindly communicated by a granddaughter of Dr. Stedman, the great-granddaughter of Henry Quincy, shows exactly how the news travelled from house to house without treachery. Mrs. Stedman lived in the Salter homestead, at the corner of Winter and Washington streets, where is now Tuttle's shoe-store: —

"It was difficult at that time to obtain servants, and Mrs. Stedman had been glad to secure the services of a woman whose husband was a British soldier named Gibson. On the evening of the eighteenth of April a grenadier in full regimentals knocked at the door and inquired for Gibson. On being told that he would soon be at the house, an order was left for him to report himself at eight o'clock at the bottom of the Common, equipped for an expedition. Mrs. Stedman hastened to inform her husband of this alarming summons, and he at once carried the intelligence to Dr. Benjamin Church, who lived near by on Washington Street. Gibson soon came in and took leave of his wife, pale with anxiety at the doubtful issue of this sudden and secret enterprise. 'Oh, Gibson!' said my mother, 'what are you going to do?' 'Ah, madam!' he replied, 'I know as little as you do. I only know that I must go.' He went, never to return. He fell on the retreat from Lexington. A few minutes before receiving the fatal shot he remarked to one of his comrades that he had never seen so hot a day, though he had served in many campaigns in Europe."

Paul Revere L'61 [1]

lish army, a lantern should be displayed in the tower of Christ Church. This signal had announced the news to the Charlestown people before

[1] [Of the likenesses of Revere, Mr. Huntoon, in an address at Canton in 1875, says: "Two pictures have been preserved of him; one, taken in the full prime of manhood, by Copley, which, after having lain neglected for many years in an attic in this town, has been finally restored. The other, by Stuart, brings up a venerable face and stately form." Perkins, *Copley's Life and Paintings*, p. 98, says the earlier picture is now owned by John Revere, of Boston. It shows him at a table, in shirt-sleeves, holding a silver cup, with engraver's tools at hand. The latter is followed in the present cut.

Revere's agreement for engraving and printing the paper money of the Provincial Congress is dated Watertown, Dec. 8, 1775, and is in the *Massachusetts Archives*, cxxviii. 271. A cut of the Massachusetts treasury-note of 1775 is given in Lossing's *Field-Book of the Revolution*, i. 534. — Ed.]

Revere arrived. He mounted his horse, and the famous "Midnight Ride" of Longfellow's ballad began. The night was clear and frosty.

With the exceptions of the patrolmen, of such leading Patriots as Warren and others, to whom they reported, and the families in which officers on duty were quartered, most of the people of Boston probably slept without knowing that the first step had been taken toward war. But before daylight on the nineteenth, General Gage had received word from Colonel Smith that the country was alarmed, and he at once ordered a detachment under arms to march out to reinforce that officer, and show the king's strength. This detachment was to be commanded by Earl Percy, who had led the five regiments which made the "promenade" of March 30 through Jamaica Plain and Dorchester. Percy was at this time a fine young officer of about thirty years of age.[1]

Percy's command consisted of the First Brigade, formed of the Fourth, Twenty-third, and Forty-seventh regiments, to which a detail of the Royal Marines was joined. To summon the marines, the order was sent to Major Pitcairn, their commander. In the precision of the red-tape of Gage's office, yet new to war, it was forgotten that Pitcairn had already gone as a volunteer with Colonel Smith. The letter therefore, with the orders to the marines, waited on his table unopened, while the rest of the detachment paraded. The venerable Harrison Gray Otis in his old age left the following account of this parade: —

"On the 19th April, 1775, I went to school for the last time. In the morning, about seven, Percy's brigade was drawn up, extending from Scollay's Buildings, through Tremont Street, and nearly to the bottom of the Mall, preparing to take up their march for Lexington. A corporal came up to me as I was going to school, and turned me off to pass down Court Street; which I did, and came up School Street to the school-house. It may well be imagined that great agitation prevailed, the British line being drawn up a few yards only from the school-house door. As I entered the school, I heard the announcement of *deponite libros*, and ran home for fear of the Regulars. Here ended my connection with Mr. Lovell's administration of the school. Soon afterward I left town, and did not return until after the evacuation by the British in March, 1776." [2]

Why does not the column move? Percy is ready. The infantry are here, and the light artillery; where are the marines? It is discovered at this late moment that the order for the marines is lying unopened at Major Pitcairn's quarters. Three or four hours before this, had anybody in Boston known it, Major Pitcairn had uttered on Lexington Common that famous appeal,

[1] He was afterward Duke of Northumberland. His letters, copied by the Rev. E. G. Porter on a recent visit at the castle of the present duke, give us some of our most vivid contemporary accounts of the Boston of that time.

[2] MS. letter of Otis to the writer, E. E. H. A tradition, which we have at first-hand, says that Master Lovell, with prophetic sagacity, said: "War's begun, and school's done; *deponite libros*." He knew that this was war, though the news of bloodshed did not reach Boston till noon.

[Loring, *Hundred Boston Orators*, p. 193, makes the young Otis just afterward a witness of the troops' march by a house which stood where the Revere House now is. — Ed.]

familiar to any school-boy in America for half a century after: "Ye villains, ye rebels, disperse! Lay down your arms. Why don't ye lay down your arms?"

But as yet no man knows where he is, and the orders for his marines are waiting. This is only an early instance of a sort of imbecility which hangs over the English army administration, revealed in many of the early anecdotes of the war.[1]

So soon as the marines were ready Percy marched, at nine o'clock. He moved south, through what is now Washington Street, to Roxbury, up the hill by the Roxbury meeting-house, to the right, where the Parting-Stone was then and is now; and so to the Brighton Bridge, where he was to cross Charles River to Cambridge. The distance from the head of School Street to that bridge by that road is about eight miles. But even if Gage was eager to save time, the boats were at Phips's Farm. Probably he and Percy both wished to make a military display. School-boys will be interested to know, that, as Percy's column approached Roxbury, Williams, the master of the grammar school, dismissed his school also, probably an hour later than Lovell dismissed his. He turned the key in the lock, joined his company, and served for the seven following years in the army. The Roxbury company of Minute Men had paraded in the mean time, summoned by the alarm from Lexington. When Percy passed, on the old road to Cambridge, they appear to have been at Jamaica Plain, whither the commander had marched them, and where Dr. Gordon was leading them in prayer. It is fair to suppose that no commander in his senses chose to have them in the line of Earl Percy's advance.

As Percy rode on, his band was playing Yankee Doodle. He observed a Roxbury boy who was uttering shouts of derision, jumping and dancing, so as to attract Percy's attention. Percy sent for the boy and asked him at what he was laughing. "You go out to Yankee Doodle," said the lad, "but you will dance by and by to Chevy Chase." It was a happy allusion to the traditions of the Percys; and Gordon, who records the anecdote, says the repartee stuck to Lord Percy all day.[2]

The day was already hot, when, after three or four hours' marching, Lord Percy and his army came to the bridge over Charles River, between Brighton and Cambridge. The bridge was a simple affair, and by General

[1] If anybody happens to care, Major Pitcairn is the nephew of the naval officer who discovered Pitcairn's Island. Observe "Marines."

[2] As the boy and Lord Percy remembered the ballad, these are some of the telling verses:—

God prosper long our noble King,
Our lives and safetyes all:
A woefull hunting once there did
In Chevy-Chase befall.

To drive the deere with hound and horne,
Erle Percy took his way;
The child may rue, that is unborne,
The hunting of that day.

. . . . .

This fight did last from break of day
Till setting of the sun,
For when they rung the evening bell
The battle scarce was done.

With stout Erle Percy, there was slaine
Sir John of Egerton.
Sir Robert Ratcliff, and Sir John,
Sir James, that bold barron.

Horace Walpole in one of his letters of the time makes the same allusion to "the hunting of that day." *Walpole's Letters to Horace Mann*, June 5, 1775.

Heath's orders the boards had been so far removed that it was impassable; but the frugal committee of safety who had done this, not knowing yet what war was, had piled the boards on the Cambridge side, instead of boldly committing them to the water. Percy sent soldiers across on the string-pieces of the bridge, who relaid the boards so far that his troops could cross. He left his baggage-train for the better completion of the bridge, and pressed on, knowing indeed that the country was growing hot in more senses than one. When he came upon Cambridge Common, where were then no fences, but many roadways leading in different directions, Lord Percy was confused, and needed instructions as to his route. Cambridge was shut up. No man, woman, or child could be found to give him information, except a tutor of the college, Isaac Smith, afterward preceptor of Dummer Academy. Smith, being asked the road to Lexington, "could not tell a lie." Instead of sending Lord Percy down to Phips's Point, as the Patriots of the time thought he should have done, he directed him to Menotomy, now Arlington, on the right road.[1] Percy followed it, and arrived in Lexington at two or three in the afternoon,[2] in time to receive Smith's scattered and worried men; but his baggage-train, delayed at the bridge, was cut off at Menotomy.[3] It appears from Percy's own letters that he did not know till he arrived at Menotomy, about one in the afternoon, that there had been any fighting beyond.

Meanwhile Dr. Warren had heard in Boston, early in the day, by a special messenger, this news which Percy did not receive till one in the afternoon. Warren left his patients in the care of Eustis.[4] He crossed to Charlestown, and never returned to his home. As he left the ferry-boat he said to the last person with whom he spoke: "Keep up a brave heart! They have begun it, — that either party can do; and we 'll end it, — that only one can do." This was at eight in the morning. He mounted his horse at Charlestown. As he rode through the town he met Dr. Welch, who said, "Well, they are gone out." "Yes, and we will be up with them before night."[5] Dr. Welch seems to have joined him. He says: "Tried to pass Percy's column; stopped by bayonets. Two British officers rode up to Dr. Warren, in the rear of the British, inquiring, 'Where are the troops?' The doctor did not know; they were greatly alarmed." These were probably the commanders of Percy's baggage-train; and this incident places Warren at Cambridge as late as twelve or one o'clock of that day.

[1] Smith was sent to Coventry by his neighbors for giving this information, and was obliged, or thought he was, to embark for England a few weeks later (May 27), where he preached to a Dissenting chapel in Sidmouth for a while; but returning in 1784, he became librarian of Harvard, and later chaplain of the Boston Almshouse. See *Evacuation Memorial*, p. 190.

[2] This is his own naming of an hour which is sometimes stated rather later in the day.

[3] [A stone beside the road and opposite the church in Arlington marks the spot where the "old men" captured this train. See Vol. II. p. 382. — Ed.]

[4] Who was afterward Lieut.-Governor and acting Governor of the State.

[5] Another diary dates this as late as ten in the morning. [See Richard Frothingham's *Life of Joseph Warren*, p. 457, (who quotes the statements in the text from a manuscript of Dr. Welch) and his *Siege of Boston*, p. 77, for further accounts. — Ed.]

A CIRCUMSTANTIAL ACCOUNT

Of an Attack that happened on the 19th of April 1775, on his MAJESTY'S Troops,

By a Number of the People of the Province of MASSACHUSETTS-BAY.

ON Tuesday the 18th of April, about half past 10 at Night, Lieutenant Colonel Smith of the 10th Regiment, embarked from the Common at Boston, with the Grenadiers and Light Infantry of the Troops there, and landed on the oppolite Side, from whence he began his March towards Concord, where he was order ed to deftroy a Magazine of Military Stores, de poſited there for the Uſe of an Army to be aſſembled, in Order to act againſt his Majeſty, and his Government. The Colonel called his Officers together, and gave Orders, that the Troops ſhould not fire, unleſs fired upon, and after marching a few Miles, detached ſix Companies of Light Infantry, under the Command of Major Pitcairn, to take Poſſeſſion of two Bridges on the other Side of Concord: Soon after they heard many Signal Guns, and the ringing of Alarm Bells repeatedly, which convinced them that the Country was riſing to oppoſe them, and that it was a preconcerted Scheme to oppoſe the King's Troops, wherever there ſhould be a favourable Opportunity for it. About 3 o'Clock the next Morning, the Troops being advanced within two Miles of Lexington, Intelligence was received that about Five Hundred Men in Arms, were aſſembled, and determined to oppoſe the King's Troops:* and on Major Pitcairn's galloping up to the Head of the advanced Companies, two Officers informed him that a Man advanced from thoſe that were aſſembled) had preſented his Muſquit and attempted to ſhoot them, but the Piece flaſhed in the Pan. On this the Major gave directions to the Troops to move forward, but on no Account to fire, nor even to attempt it without Orders. When they arrived at the End of the Village, they obſerved about 200 armed Men, drawn up on a Green, and when the Troops came within a Hundred Yards of them, they began to file off towards ſome Stone Walls, on their right Flank. The Light Infantry obſerving this, ran after them: the Major inſtantly called to the Soldiers not to fire, but to ſurround and diſarm them, ſome of them who had jumped over a Wall, then fired four or five Shot at the Troops, wounded a Man of the 10th Regiment, and the Major's Horſe in two Places, and at the ſame Time ſeveral Shots were fired from a Meeting Houſe on the left.† Upon this, without any Order or Regularity, the Light Infantry began a ſcattered Fire, and killed ſeveral of the Country People; but were ſilenced as ſoon as the Authority of their Officers could make them.

† After this, Colonel Smith marched up with the Remainder of the Detachment, and the whole Body proceeded to Concord, where they arrived about 9 o'Clock without any Thing further happening: but vaſt numbers of armed People were ſeen Aſſembling on all the Heights who Colonel Smith with the Grenadiers, and Part of the Light Infantry remained at Concord, to ſearch for Cannon, &c there; he detached Captain Parſons with ſix Light Companies to ſecure a Bridge at ſome Diſtance from Concord, and to proceed from thence to certain Houſes, where it was ſuppoſed there was Cannon, and Ammunition, Captain Parſons in purſuance of theſe Orders, poſted three Compa-

* At this Time the advanced Light Companies loaded but the Grenadiers were not ordered when they received their firſt fire.

† Notwithſtanding the Fire from the Meeting Houſe, Colonel Smith and Major Pitcairn with a ſmall Detachment Expoſed themſelves for ſeveral Minutes before the Meeting Houſe and parted without much Diſturbance.

nies at the Bridge, and on ſome Heights near it, under the Command of Captain Laurie of the 43d Regiment; and with the Remainder went and deſtroyed ſome Cannon Wheels, Powder, and Ball; the People ſtill continued increaſing on the Heights; and about an Hour after, a large Body of them began to move towards the Bridge; the Light Companies of the 4th and 10th then deſcended, and joined Captain Laurie, the People continued to advance in great Numbers; and fired upon the Kings Troops, killed three Men, wounded four Officers, one Sergeant, and four private Men, upon which (after returning the fire) Captain Laurie and his Officers, thought it prudent to retreat towards the Main Body at Concord, and were ſoon joined by two Companies of Grenadiers, when Captain Parſons returned with the three Companies over the Bridge, they obſerved three Soldiers on the Ground one of them ſcalped, his Head much mangled, and his Ears cut off, tho' not quite dead; a Sight which ſtruck the Soldiers with Horror, Captain Parſons marched on and joined the Main Body, who were only waiting for his coming up, to march back to Boſton; Colonel Smith had executed his Orders, without Oppoſition, by deſtroying all the Military Stores he could find; both the Colonel, and Major Pitcairn, having taken all poſſible Pains to convince the Inhabitants that no Injury was intended them, and that if they opened their Doors when required, to ſearch for ſaid Stores, not the ſmalleſt Miſchief ſhould be done, neither had any of the People the leaſt Occaſion to complain, but they were ſulky, and one of them even ſtruck Major Pitcairn. Except upon Captain Laurie, at the Bridge, no Hoſtilities happened from the Affair at Lexington, until the Troops began their March back. As ſoon as the Troops had got out of the Town of Concord, they received a heavy Fire from all Sides, from Walls, Fences, Houſes, Trees, Barns, &c. which continued without Intermiſſion, till they met the firſt Brigade, with two Field Pieces, near Lexington; ordered out under the Command of Lord Percy to ſupport them; (advice having been received about 7 o'Clock next Morning, that Signals had been made, and Expreſſes gone out to alarm the Country, and that the People were riſing to attack the Troops under Colonel Smith.) Upon the Firing of the Field Pieces, the People's Fire was for a while ſilenced, but as they ſtill continued to encreaſe greatly in Numbers, they fired again as before, from all Places were they could find Cover, upon the whole Body, and continued ſo doing for the Space of Fifteen Miles: Notwithſtanding their Numbers they didnot attack openly during the Whole Day, but kept under Cover on all Occaſions. The Troops were very much fatigued, the greater Part of them having been under Arms all Night, and made a March of upwards of Forty Miles before they arrived at Charleſtown, from whence they were ferryed over to Boſton.

The Troops had above Fifty killed, and many more wounded. Reports are various about the Loſs ſuſtained by the Country People, ſome make it very conſiderable, others not ſo much.

That this unfortunate Affair has happened through the Raſhneſs and Imprudence of a few People, who began Firing on the Troops at Lexington

The anxiety of Boston that day is easily imagined.[1] Gage had sent out a considerable part of his army, eighteen hundred men, from a force not four thousand. His communication with his force in the field was by no means as good as that of the Patriots. The sun had gone down when, to anxious eyes watching from Beacon Hill, the flashes of muskets on Milk Row[2] — the road from Cambridge to Charlestown — revealed the line of the retreat. Percy was now in command. He did not mean to risk an embarkation at Phips's Point, where the boats were still lying. Pickering's Essex regiment was on his flank at Winter Hill, and he chose to put Charlestown Neck between himself and pursuit.[3] He arrived there after eight o'clock. Heath, who during the afternoon had been exercising a general command, called off the Patriot forces. Percy bivouacked on Bunker Hill; and thus was the war begun.[4] The selectmen sent word to Percy that if he would not attack Charlestown they would take care that his troops should not be molested, and would do all in their power to get them over the ferry. The "Somerset" man-of-war sent her boats first for the wounded, then for the rest of the troops. The pickets of the Tenth regiment were sent from Boston to keep all quiet. The Americans put sentinels at Charlestown Neck, and made prisoner of an officer of the Sixty-fourth, who was going to join his regiment at Castle William.

From that time till the next March, what is popularly called "the siege of Boston" continued. Civil government stopped in the town. The selectmen's record ends with a typical blank: "At a meeting of the selectmen, this 19th Apl., 1775, present, Mesrs. Newhall, Austin, Marshall, ———," and this is all! The civil magistracy did no more as matter of formal record till March 5, 1776, when they appear again. Martial law came in, of which a contemporary definition says: "A provost-marshal is a man who does as he chooses; and martial law is permission to him to do so."

All the night of the battle-day minute-men were marching and riding from all parts of New England to Cambridge. Before daybreak of the

[1] [The various rumors which reached Boston, during the progress of events that day, are noted in Andrews's letters. *Mass. Hist. Soc. Proc.*, July, 1865, p. 404. — Ed.]

[2] Now, alas! "Washington Street," in Somerville.

[3] ["Had Earl Percy returned to Boston by the same road he marched out, . . . probably his brigade might have been cut off." So says Percy's eulogist, Major R. Donkin in his *Military Collections*: New York, 1777, p. 87. This book, which is rare, is in Harvard College Library. It is dedicated to Percy, and ostensibly published for the benefit of the families of the victims "of the bloody massacre committed on his Majesty's troops peaceably marching to and from Concord, the 19th April, 1775, begun and instigated by the Massachusetians." — Ed.]

[4] [In the senate-chamber at the State House are some interesting relics of Lexington, — two firelocks bequeathed to the State by Theodore Parker: one, the first firearm captured in the war; and the other carried by the testator's grandfather, Captain John Parker, on that day. See *Hist. Mag.*, July, 1860, by J. S. Loring. An official report of the selectmen of the losses to property sustained at Lexington, and made Jan. 24, 1782, is in *Massachusetts Archives*, cxxviii. 410. Numerous relics of the fight have been collected in the Town Hall at Lexington, and

various houses are still standing there which bear marks of the fray. Statues of Hancock and Adams are also in the hall. — Ed.]

morning of the twentieth, little towns in the western part of Worcester County were awakened by the tramp of men pressing eastward, or by the rumble of the wagons which bore them. Before night a considerable army was in Cambridge. And Gage never again sent an armed man out by land from Boston, as Boston is now constituted. Indeed, no man of his other than deserters, of which there were many, after this moment set foot in Roxbury or in Brighton except as a prisoner; nor in Dorchester, excepting Dorchester Neck, which is now South Boston.

In describing the siege, we shall speak of Boston as it was then understood; meaning the peninsula. A considerable part of the American army was in Roxbury and in Brighton. These places, and Charlestown where the great battle of the siege was fought, and Dorchester Heights where the end came, are now all included within the city. But we shall speak of these places by their old names.

General Clinton, who afterward commanded the British army, was not here on the day of the battle of Lexington; but he says of Percy's movement: "He gave them every reason to suppose that he would return by the route he came, but fell back on Charlestown; thus securing his retreat unmolested, and a place which ought never to have been given up, and which cost us half the force engaged to recover."[1] This means that at North Cambridge Percy took the more direct route to Charlestown, instead of making the angle at Cambridge Common.[2] But if he had attempted to add nine miles to the march of men, many of whom had already marched thirty, he would have found at Charles River the bridge again removed, and barricades erected from the materials. He had his train of wounded in carriages which he had seized for their conveyance. In point of fact, he did not secure his retreat; for he received at Prospect Hill the hottest fire of the way. His own account is distinct: "In this manner we retired for fifteen miles, under incessant fire all around us, till we arrived at Charlestown, which road I chose to take, lest the rebels should have taken up the bridge at Cambridge (which I find was actually the case), and also as the country was more open and the road shorter."[3] Stragglers had given the alarm of their approach in Charlestown. As the tired army filed in on the Neck it met streams of people pouring out. The Regulars, no longer pursued, vented their rage in frightening women and children as they emptied their pieces. The soldiers called for drink at taverns and houses, and "encamped on a place called Bunker's Hill."[4]

When, on the night of the nineteenth and on the morning of the twentieth, wounded and dying men were brought into Boston from Charles-

[1] Clinton's MS. notes to Stedman's *History*. [This copy of Stedman is in the Carter-Brown Library at Providence. See Winsor's *Handbook*, p. 130. — Ed.]

[2] [There was a story current at the time that Percy in returning from Concord had intended to stop at Cambridge and fortify, after destroying the college buildings, being reinforced across the water from Boston. See note to Mansfield's sermon in the Roxbury Camp, Nov. 23, 1775, as quoted by Thornton, *Pulpit of the Revolution*, p. 236. — Ed.]

[3] Percy's MS. letter to his father, from a copy in the hands of the Rev E. G. Porter.

[4] For the origin of this name see Vol. I. p. 390.


General Gage gives Liberty to the Inhabitants to
Remove out of Town with their Effects, and in order
to Expedite their Removal informs the Inhabitants
that they may receive passes for that purpose
from General Robinson any time after 8 o'Clock
to morrow Morning
Boston April 27th 1775

GAGE'S ORDER.

NOTE. — The negotiation to effect this order began in a town-meeting, April 22, when James Bowdoin presided, and ended at an adjourned meeting with an agreement to surrender their arms. The story of this covenant, and Gage's failure to keep to his word, is told in the *Evacuation Memorial*, p. 117; also see *Siege of Boston*, p. 95. Among the papers preserved in the Charity Building with the overseers of the poor, is an account of the arms returned to General Gage, April 24, 1775. Andrews writes: "You see parents that are lucky enough to procure papers [of permission to leave the town], with bundles in one hand and a string of children in the other, wandering out of town, not knowing whither they go. . . . This morning [May 6] an order from the Governor has put a stop to any more papers at any rate. . . . It is hard to stay cooped up here and fed upon salt provisions. . . . The soldiery think they have a license to plunder every one's house and store who leaves the town." Bowdoin was during much of this period too ill to take a prominent part in the active duties of the hour. Abigail Adams writes to her husband only two days before Bunker Hill: "Mr. Bowdoin and his lady are at present in the house of Mrs. Borland, and are going to Middleboro to the house of Judge Oliver. He, poor gentleman, is so low that I apprehend he is hastening to a house not made with hands; he looks like a mere skeleton, speaks faint and low, is racked with a violent cough, and I think far advanced in a consumption." — *Familiar Letters, etc.* p. 63. — ED.]

town and carried to their quarters and to hospitals, people began to see what war was. That part of the towns-people who did not favor the English began to move into the country with such stores as they could carry. Gage insisted that they should not take their arms, and made a sort of convention, which caused much discussion afterward, by which he promised to give permits for departure to all who would deliver their arms. In fact "1,778 firearms, 973 bayonets, 634 pistols, and 38 blunderbusses" were delivered. The number shows the military habit of the people. The tradition of the next generation said that they were in very poor order for use.

Gage attempted to limit the number of wagoners, who should enter daily from the country, to thirty a day. In regard to this he received sharp remonstrances from Dr. Warren,[1] who on the twenty-third began to act as chairman of the provincial committee of safety. Before long the English generals were glad to diminish the number of mouths they had to feed. Additional parties were sent out after the hot weather of summer came on. Some of them carried small-pox with them. The last was a party of three hundred poor people sent out on November 25. Many families left Boston in this emigration which have never returned. To this day, in many of the inland towns of New England, the family tradition takes in the hurried departure from Boston "when the siege began." On the other hand, some royalist families moved in from the country. There is a good deal of correspondence about Lady Frankland,—the same who saved her husband[2] at the earthquake at Lisbon, — and the quantity of live stock and furniture which she might bring into town from Hopkinton, where was her home.[3]

On the very day of the battle of Lexington a corps of Loyalists was formed in Boston. Two hundred tradesmen and merchants offered their services to Gage, and were accepted. Their corps was placed under the command of Timothy Ruggles, of Hardwick, — the same who presided at Philadelphia at the first Continental Congress, ten years before. They are spoken of as "the gentlemen volunteers." It was said that Ruggles was the best soldier in the colonies, and that he would have been in high command among the Americans had he taken the right side.[4]



[1] In a letter dated the twenty-sixth or twenty-ninth, not the twentieth, as erroneously printed in Force and later writers.

[2] Oliver Cromwell's great-great grandson.

[3] "*Hopkinton, May* 15, 1775. — Lady Franklamd begs she may have her pass for Thursday. A list of things for Lady Frankland: six trunks, one chest, three beds and bedding, six wethers, two pigs, one small keg of pickled tongues, some hay, three bags of corn." The answer of the Provincial Congress is Homeric: "*Resolved*, that Lady Frankland be permitted to go to Boston with the following articles, — viz., seven trunks; all the beds with the furniture to them; all the boxes and crates; a basket of chickens, and a bag of corn; two barrels and a hamper; two horses and two chaises, and all the articles in the chaise, excepting arms and ammunition; one phaeton; some tongues, ham, and veal; and sundry small bundles." [See Vol. II. p. 526. — ED.]

[4] [As the winter wore on, the Loyalists in Boston were formed into military organizations for guard duty and the like: the Loyal American Associators, Brigadier-General Timothy Ruggles, commandant; Loyal Irish Volunteers, James Forrest, captain; Royal Fencible Americans, Colonel Gorham. — ED.]

The Tory party gradually acquired more and more ascendancy with Gage. They were afraid that when the town was emptied of Whigs the American army would burn it. At last they threatened Gage that they would lay down their arms and leave themselves, if he permitted further departure. It was under the pressure of this threat that Gage at last gave way, and, as the Patriots said, violated the engagements he made when they delivered up their arms as already mentioned.

The time had now come, and it was the first time, when men and households had to make known, by a visible and final act, whether they stood by the court of England or by the country. Households were often divided against themselves. The following lines from one of the many comedies and tragedies of the time, — of which most of the comedies are tragic, and the tragedies comic, — expresses the situation: —

> "What wretch like me
> Sees misery in each alternative?
> Defeat is death; and even victory, ruin.
> Here my father, dearest, best of parents,
> Whose heart, exhaustless as a mountain stream,
> Pours one continued flood of kindness on me.
> There is my brother; there, too, is Rossiter,
> One of the number, — all perhaps may fall;
> Fall by each other's arm — inhuman thought!
> O madness, madness! Sure the arm of death
> O'er such a field may grow fatigued with conquest,
> Nor need new trophies to adorn his car
> With deeper deeds of honor."

Meanwhile the minute-men, who had assembled so promptly, were for some days under no central command. On the outside the Patriots were afraid Gage would march out, — as, on the inside, he probably was afraid that they would march in. Colonel Robinson, of Dorchester, who with six or seven hundred men only was watching Boston Neck in those days, spent nine days and nights without "shifting his clothes," or lying down to sleep. Without an adjutant or officer of the day, he patrolled his own lines every night, — a march of nine miles. But Gage had no thought of another "promenade."[1]

His own subordinates accuse him of inaction. Lord Percy writes to his father in May: "The rebels have lately amused themselves with burning the houses on an island just under the admiral's nose; and a schooner, with four carriage-guns and some swivels, which he sent to drive them off, unfortunately got ashore, and the rebels burned her." This was at Hog Island. Putnam led in the affair, and won in it the reputation which helped him in the assignment of commissions the next month.[2]

[1] [Thomas, a little later, deceived the British General by marching and remarching his troops along a course which could be observed by the British outposts, to give the appearance of a larger force than he had. — Ed.]

[2] [See Frothingham's *Siege of Boston*, p. 109; Sumner's *East Boston*, p. 351; *N. E. Hist. and Geneal. Reg.*, April, 1857, p. 137; Lives of Putnam; Force's *Archives*, etc. The affair happened May 27, 1775. It was during this month that



Panoramic View from Beacon Hill, 1775.

The truth is that until May 25 Gage's force was less than four thousand men. Of the columns engaged on the nineteenth he had lost two hundred and four, — one in nine, — a very large proportion. He had nothing to march out for, for the best success would be to come back again. He withdrew from Marshfield his one outlying detachment, and acted in the spirit of this despatch, which he had already sent home: —

"The Regiments are now composed of small numbers, and Irregulars will be necessary in this country, many of which, of one sort or other, I conceive may be raised here. Nothing that is said at present can palliate. Conciliating, moderation, reasoning, is over; nothing can be done but by forcible means. Tho' the people are not held in high estimation by the Troops, yet they are numerous, worked up to a Fury, and not a Boston rabble, but the Farmers and the Freeholders of the country. A check anywhere will be fatal, and the first stroke will decide a great deal. We should therefore be strong, and proceed on a good foundation before anything decisive is tried." [1]

As the summer advanced, Gage and Howe fortified the town carefully. In the Charles River they had a floating battery of six cannon; and on Fox Hill (now levelled), within the present Public Garden, at the bottom of the Common, cannon were mounted, which commanded the passes of the Neck. There was an entrenchment where the monument now stands on the Common. Upon the hill toward Cambridge, now partly levelled and known as Louisburg Square and Mount Vernon, a mortar battery played upon Cambridge. This position was considered so safe that boys and other idlers, even women, stood by the gunners to mark the shots.[2] On Copp's

Gage's boats patrolled the mouth of the Charles to give notice of "fire-stages" which the Provincials were preparing to send down to burn his ships. — Ed.]

[1] MS. in English State-Papers.

[2] [The works occupied by the besieged on the Common may be more particularly described as follows; but some of them were not built till after the battle at Charlestown: —

A small zigzag earthwork, for infantry defence, opposite a point on Beacon Street, halfway between Spruce and Charles streets, then the upland margin.

A small redoubt on Fox Hill, as in the text.

An earthwork where Charles and Boylston streets now meet, — then at the marsh-edge, — probably for infantry defence.

A long redoubt, occupying the space between Pleasant Street, on its curve, and the water, and commanding a wharf, which was just south of the spot where now the Emancipation Group stands.

Crowning the bluff above the marsh, and at the point of the present junction of Boylston and Carver streets, there was a bastioned redoubt; and another of a square shape on the hill where the monument now stands, some light breastworks being thrown up between them on the edge of the marsh.

These were the provisions which the British General had made to resist any attempt by Washington to attack with boats. They are shown in Page's map, as are also the earthworks along the ridge to the north of Beacon Street. First, an oblong redoubt on the summit, back of the State House, which is shown in the panoramic view given in this chapter, in heliotype. Second, a redoubt facing the Common, not far from the junction of Walnut and Chestnut streets. Third, a larger redoubt, crossing Chestnut Street near Spruce and Willow, facing the water. Fourth, an open breastwork by the shore, between Pinckney and Mount Vernon Streets, just above Charles Up to Christmas, notwithstanding the severe cannonade which the British had often maintained, only twelve persons had been killed in Roxbury, and seven on the Cambridge side.

The accompanying heliotype shows the four sections of a water-color panoramic view from Beacon Hill, thus inscribed: —

"A view of the country round Boston, taken from Beacon hill, shewing the lines, Intrenchments, Redouts, etc. of the Rebels; also the

Hill, at the North End, was a battery of six pieces of cannon, which commanded the river and Charlestown shore. There were two *flèches* where Blackstone Square and Franklin Square are, from each of which a piece of artillery commanded the road.[1] Nor could there now be a better memorial of the war than to restore them in those pretty grounds, and mount there two old cannon from the many trophies of the war. Nearer Boston more extensive works protected the Neck; and near Dover Street was a gateway and other defences, of which the only memorial now is in the name of Fort Avenue, — an insignificant alley-way.[2]

On May 8, on an alarm that Gage was going to march out, the minutemen from the towns around Boston rallied at command, and the British General could see what he would meet if he needed any lesson. On the thirteenth, General Putnam marched a little army of two thousand three hundred men through Charlestown to the ferry and back, "which very much astonished them." The affair at Hog Island, already referred to, was one of several raids, following an order of the provincial executive that all live stock should be removed from the islands. And in two only of these affairs Gage lost two thousand sheep, "from under the admiral's nose," as Percy says. He little foresaw how much he would be needing fresh provisions.[3] Before a year was over, his government was shipping from England to Boston living oxen, pigs, and sheep to feed the army, only one cargo of which

Lines and Redouts of his Majesties Troops. N. B. — These views were taken by Lt Williams of the R. W. Fuziliers,* and copied from a Scetch of the original drawn by Lt Woodd of the same Regiment. The original drawings are now in the possession of the King."

Mr. J. Carson Brevoort, of Brooklyn, who gave this view to the Historical Society, in December, 1859, says he purchased it of Charles Welford, about 1858. Mr. Brevoort says, in a letter to the Editor: "It was the custom to send from the foreign and plantation office all that might be of interest to the map-makers, and I suppose that it found its way there among such matter."—Ed.] Faden was the King's engraver. At a sale of his effects about forty years since, many such maps and drawings came to light. A collection of one hundred, once belonging to Nathan Hale, is now in the Congressional Library at Washington.

* The Welsh Fusiliers were one of the most famous regiments in the garrison. Donkin, in his *Military Collections*, p. 133, tells of the "privilegeous honor" enjoyed by them "of passing in review preceded by a Goat with gilded horns;" and on March 1 (St. David's Day), in Boston, in 1775, "the animal gave such a spring from the floor that he dropped his rider upon the table" of the banqueting officers, "and then, bouncing over their heads, ran to the barracks with all his trappings, to the no small joy of the garrison and populace"

[1] [Brown's house, which figures largely in the accounts, stood on the westerly side of Washington Street, a little south of Blackstone Square; and was occupied by the British as an advanced post, when Majors Tupper and Crane, with a party of volunteers, attacked it, July 8, and, driving off the occupants, burned the buildings. — Ed.]

[2] MS. notes of Hon. James T. Austin. [In March, 1865, workmen in digging for a drain opposite Williams Market laid bare a considerable section of the foundations of the old defences The plan of the Neck lines by Mifflin, and of the Peninsula, by Trumbull, which are shown in the accompanying heliotype, are described with other plans in the Introduction to the present volume The views of the British lines on the Neck, looking out and in, given also in heliotype in this chapter, follow some engraved representations published to accompany a series of coast charts by DesBarres. — Ed.]

[3] Gage in his despatches was always blaming Graves, the admiral, who was at length removed before the end of the year. In King George's note to North, ordering the removal, he said he thought the admiral's removal as necessary as that of "the mild general," — his name for Gage.

Explanations
In Cambridge
1. Bunkers Hill
2. New Works on Prospect Hill
3. Winter Hill
4. Prospect Hill
5. Old Pallisaded Works
6. Lines of Redoubts towards the River to Bay
7. Redoubt at Sewalls Point
In Roxbury
1. Strong Lines with Works
2. Small Works to defend the Marsh
3. Small Works in the Street
4. Battery to defend the Marsh
5. Fort on Meetinghouse Hill
6. Redoubt on Rock commanding
7. Lines
Roxbury
Boston, & the surrounding Country, & Posts of the American Troops

Col. Trumbull's Plan, 1775.

Mifflin's Plan of the British Fortifications on Boston Neck.

A View of the country towards Cambridge taken from the advanced works on Boston Neck.

A View of the [illegible] taken from the [illegible]

ever arrived. "The English channel is white with sheep which have been thrown overboard," says a contemporary account.

The narratives of the time show the exuberant enthusiasm of recruits, to whom war is a novelty. A party at Noddle's Island captured a barge be-



longing to a man-of-war. They carried it to Cambridge in triumph; and on June 5 took it to Roxbury in a cart, with the sails up and three men in it. "It was marched round the meeting-house while the engineer fired the cannon for joy." On the next day Generals Thomas and Heath went to lay out a place at Dorchester Point, with a view to entrenchments.

Through these sixty days, between the battles of Lexington and Bunker Hill, there appear to have been occasional passages in and out of the town; but care was in all cases taken that no military or other stores should pass. On May 25 Gage received large reinforcements. The Government also sent him three generals,—Howe, Clinton, and Burgoyne,[1] who all came in the "Cerberus."





The wags called them the three "bow-wows." Gage was now better fitted for aggressive movements. On June 12, he issued his celebrated proclamation, greatly ridiculed at the time, in which he offered pardon to all but Samuel Adams and John Hancock.

Of course he saw the importance of securing Dorchester Heights and Charlestown, quite as distinctly as did the Patriot leaders. Burgoyne says that it was agreed that they should land at the Point and occupy Dorchester Heights on Sun-



day, June 18. Before that time the American troops had more than once been called out by alarms in this direction. The provincial executive were apprised of this plan, and in consequence selected the night of June 16, to fortify Bunker

[1] [There is a contemporary engraving of Burgoyne in the *Political Magazine*, December, 1780. — Ed.]

Hill on the northern side of the harbor. At their order General Ward sent a detachment from Cambridge, which reached Bunker Hill about ten at night. It consisted of Prescott's, Frye's, and Bridge's regiments, under Colonel Prescott,[1] and a party of Connecticut men under Captain Knowlton. It was a moonlight night, and clear. On the top of Bunker Hill they were only a mile from the English battery on Copp's Hill. Prescott called the field-officers together and showed them his orders. At that late moment they were in doubt whether to fortify the summit where they were, or to proceed less than half a mile nearer Boston to Breed's Farm, where the hill fell off suddenly toward the south, and where they could better annoy the English shipping, and more readily command the town. The consultation took much time, but at last the bolder course was adopted, under pressure of Gridley,[2] the engineer officer, who said he must work somewhere. The determination is now justified by the highest military authority.[3] Had



[1] [Here is a token of preparation: —

"MAJOR BARBER, — Please to deliver to Captain Densmore 350 rounds and 30 flints.

"WM. PRESCOTT, COL[L]

"June 16, 1775."

The original is in Mellen Chamberlain's manuscript collection. The tradition is that the lead pipes of Christ Church, Cambridge, were melted or pounded into slugs at this time. — ED.]

[2] [The best account of Richard Gridley, of Louisburg fame, is contained in an oration by D. T. V. Huntoon delivered at Canton, Massachusetts, in 1877. He was the son of Richard Gridley, a brother of Jeremy Gridley (see Mr. Morse's chapter on the "Bench and Bar" in Vol. IV.), and was born Jan. 3, 1710–11. Gridley played a distinguished part at Louisburg, and in the later campaigns against the French. He had removed from Boston to Canton about 1773. — ED.]

[3] [Various contemporary maps of the battle are noted in the Introduction to this volume. The annexed plan indicates the position of the redoubt and the breastwork in relation to the present Monument Square and the monument, following a plan given by T. W. Davis in the *Bunker Hill Monument Asso. Proc.* 1875. — ED.]



the higher hill only been fortified, the English troops, to attack it, could have been formed without molestation under cover of the lower hill. Short-time shells, such as would now be dropped on such a party, were not then used.

Fairly at work on Breed's farm, Gridley laid out his redoubt skilfully. It measured eight rods on the longest side, which fronted Charlestown; the other sides were shorter. A breastwork ran about a hundred yards toward the north, to a marshy spot which was relied on as a sufficient check against troops. From midnight till eleven o'clock in the morning the men worked steadily, and the intrenching-tools were then sent back to Putnam, who persevered through the day in the true military policy of fortifying the upper summit also. Once and again through the night men went down to the water's edge, and could hear the "All's well" of the watch on the English vessels. It was after daybreak when Linzee, the commander of the "Falcon" which lay in the stream, opened his fire on it, and waked the sleeping town.[1] Gridley returned Linzee's fire from his wretched field-pieces. Gage soon ordered Linzee to cease firing, and, having conferred with his associates, determined to attack the works before they should be strengthened.[2] With a bold resolution, — of which there is more than one instance among British commanders in the beginning of wars, — Gage made the fatal decision, in spite of Clinton's remonstrance, to attack these works in front.[3] With his naval force, by which he could have commanded Charlestown Neck, he could, perhaps, have cut off the American party without the loss of a man.

[1] Captain Linzee was the grandfather of the wife of William H. Prescott the historian, who was the grandson of Colonel Prescott. The two swords worn by these two officers on that morning were bequeathed by Mr. Prescott to the Massachusetts Historical Society, and have long been peacefully crossed in its Library, as they were earlier in his. [They are represented in the frontispiece of this volume. See Ticknor's *Life of W. H. Prescott*, and Dr. William Prescott's *Prescott Memorial*, 1870. — Ed.]

[2] [Colonel Prescott, observing Gage's disposition, despatched Major John Brooks to headquarters for reinforcements, and he reached General Ward about ten o'clock.

There is a portrait of Governor Brooks, with a sketch of his life, in Drake's *Cincinnati Society*. See also *N. E. Hist. and Geneal. Reg.* July, 1865. Ed.]

[3] [Gage having overruled the decision of a majority of his council to attack in the rear, and bound to hazard an attack in front, which he deemed more military and prudent, issued the order, a *fac-simile* of which may be found on the next page. This *fac-simile* follows the entry in an orderly book, preserved in the cabinet of the Mass. Historical Society, entitled *Lieutenant and Adjutant Waller's orderly-book, commencing at Boston, the 22d May, and ending the twenty-sixth day of January*, 1776; a folio parchment-bound MS. which really begins "Plymouth [England], March 25, 1775, on board the 'Betsy' transport," with "rules and directions to be observed on board the transport for Boston." Then follow "General Gage's and Major Pitcairn's orders, Boston Camp." A new section begins: "June 18 [1775]. Charles Town Hill, Gen! Howe's orders;" and the next day the following: "General orders, Head Quarters, Boston, June 19, 1775. The Commander-in-chief returns his most grateful thanks to Major Gen! Howe for the extraordinary exertion of his military abilities on the 17th inst. He returns his thanks also to Maj.-Gen. Clinton and Brig.-Gen. Pigot for the share they took in the success of the day; as well as to Lieut.-Cols. Nisbet, Abercrombie, Gunning, and Clark; Majors Butler, Williams, Bruce, Tupper, Spendlove, Smelt, and Mitchel; and the rest of the officers and soldiers who, by remarkable ef-

General Howe was entrusted with the enterprise. With two thousand men he crossed at noon to Moulton's Point, embraced within the present Navy Yard.[1] As soon as the boats could cross a second time, General Pigot, his second in command, moved slowly to the left, throwing out strong flanking parties upon the redoubt. Up to this time his men had been under the cover of the bold hill at Moulton's Point. While Howe waited for his second party, he had reconnoitred the position so far as to

forts of courage and gallantry, overcame every disadvantage and drove the rebels from their redoubt and strong-hold on the Heights of Charles Town and gained a complete victory." The same



Gen.l Morning Orders June 17.th 10 Oclock.
The Companies of the 35.th & 49.th Regt.s that are arrived, to Land as soon as the Transports can get to the Wharf, and to Encamp on the Ground, Mark'd out for them on the Common, Captain Handfield is appointed to Act as an Assistant to the Deputy D.r Master General and is to be Obey'd as such, The Ten Eldest Companies of Grenadiers, and the Ten Eldest Companies of Light Infy.t Exclusive of the Regiments Lately Landed, the 5.th & 38.th Regt.s to parade at ½ past 11 Oclock with their Arms Ammunition Blankets and the provision Order to be Cook'd this Morning, they will March by Files to the Long Wharf the 52.d Regt. & 43.d with the Remaining Companies of Grenadiers & Lyte Infy.t to parade at the same time with the same Directions and March to the North-Battery — the 47.th and 1.st Batt.n Marines will also March as above Directed to the same Battery after the Rest are Embark'd, and be Ready to Embark there — when Order'd, the Rest of the Troops will be kept in Readiness to March at the Moments Warning 1 Sub. 1 Serj.t 1 Corp.l 1 Drum.r and 20 private to be left by Each Corps for the Security of their respective Camps. — Any Man Who shall Quit his Ranks on any pretence, or shall Dare to Plunder or pillage will be Executed without Mercy

day a general order read: "A return of the killed, wounded, and missing of the different Corps in the late action of the 17th to be given in as soon as possible. The officers to be mentioned nomanly [? nominally] in these returns." The orderly-books of Generals Gage and Howe are preserved among the Carleton papers in the Royal Institution in London; and extracts from them, made in 1840, are in the Sparks MSS., vol. xlv. — Ed.]

[1] [The lower ship-house marks the beach where these troops left their boats. The reinforcements landed in front of the present marine barracks. The "Falcon" ship of war covered the landing at the points; and the "Lively," of twenty guns and one hundred and thirty men, was anchored in front of the present Navy Yard, and covered the landings of the reinforcements. Many of the slain were buried within the dock-yard enclosure. — Ed.]

see that it might be possible to move along the shore of the Mystic River, and thus attack the American entrenchments on the rear. From the marshy point already spoken of, northward to the river, the only line of defence was what has long been popularly called the "rail-fence," erected by Knowlton and his men, who had been sent out by Prescott to cover his left flank. They had protected themselves, in farmer fashion, by putting up a line of rail-fence parallel with one already standing, and packing the space between with new-mown hay. Howe's contempt for this unmilitary breastwork cost him dear in the end. So soon as he was reinforced he moved westward with his right wing along the river-side, while Pigot, with the left wing, attempted the breastwork and redoubt.

All along the American lines the order had been given which the officers remembered in the memoirs of Frederick's wars: "Wait till you can see the whites of their eyes."[1] They were bidden, in the redoubt, to hold their fire till the English came within eight rods. Pigot's men advanced slowly, firing as they marched. Their shot passed over the heads of the Americans. It must be remembered that most of the Englishmen were as new to battle as their enemies. Some eager soldiers in the American lines were disposed to reply; but their officers even ran along the parapet and kicked up their guns. Prescott told those who could hear him, that the "red-coats" would never reach the redoubt if they would obey him. Sure enough, when the order to fire came, the issue was terrible. For a few minutes the fire was returned, but for only a few. Pigot was obliged to order a retreat. "He was staggered," says an English account at the time, "and retreated by orders." Some of his men ran even to the landing. Burgoyne's letter, written for publication,[2] also says "he was staggered;" and reinforcements were sent to him.

Howe's fate with the right wing was similar; but probably his companies suffered more severely. They could not advance by any road, and were obliged to climb the rail-fences which parted the fields, or to break them down. Knowlton and Putnam were begging and commanding their men not to fire. A single shot, intended to draw the enemy's fire, obtained its end. Howe's companies fired like troops on parade, and fired too high. When the word was given to the Connecticut men, the well aimed shots from the rail-fence made terrible havoc; the English wavered, broke, and retreated. Many of the exultant American soldiers leaped over the fence to follow them, and had to be held back by their officers.

Prescott praised and encouraged his men. Putnam rode back to Charlestown Neck to urge on reinforcements. Men had been sent from Cam-

[1] Prince Charles, when he cut through the Austrian army, in retiring from Jägendorf, gave this order to his infantry: "Silent, till you see the whites of their eyes." This was on May 22, 1745; and this order, so successful that day, was remembered twelve years after at the battle of Prague, when the general Prussian order was, "By push of bayonets; no firing till you see the whites of their eyes."

[2] Addressed to Lord Stanley.



ON THE FIELD.[1]

bridge, who dared not cross the Neck, raked as it was by the fire of English vessels in the river.[2] At Howe's command, meanwhile, Burgoyne, who was in the English battery on Copp's Hill,[3] set fire to Charlestown with red-hot shot.[4] Howe probably supposed that the houses were cover for American soldiers. But, in fact, Prescott had few if any men to spare outside of his works.

Howe re-formed his broken lines after some pause; sent to Boston for proper balls for his field-pieces;[5] and, under the smoke and fire of

[1] [This bit of writing represents, perhaps, the only relic like it of the battle-field. It was seemingly written hastily, with whatever might serve for a pen, on a slip of paper torn from the margin of a book, and was not long ago found among some loose papers at the State House. Joseph Ward was of Newton, was made an aid by General Heath on the day following Lexington, and at this time



was aid to General Ward; and so distinguished himself at Bunker Hill that when his conduct was subsequently reported to Washington, he gave him a pair of pistols, which are now owned by Mr. D. Ward A portrait of him is in the possession of R. R. Bishop; and a miniature by Dunkelery, 1789, is owned by Mrs. Osgood of Cohasset. (Drake's *Landmarks of Middlesex*, p. 349.) He continued to be General Ward's aid when this General commanded later in Boston, and his signatures to official documents, written under less exciting circumstances, indicate a good penman. Dr. Smith in his *Hist. of Newton*, p. 343, says that Ward was, in 1775, a master in one of the Boston schools, and, seeing the troops in motion on April 19, left the town for Newton, where he got a gun and hastened to Concord. On June 17 he "rode over Charlestown Neck, through a cross-fire of the enemy's batteries, to execute an order for General Ward." — Ed.]

[2] [Gage was afterward blamed for not putting his gun-boats on the Mystic also. — Ed.]

[3] [The defence on Copp's Hill, at the time of the battle, was an earthwork made in part of barrels filled with sand, and mounted six heavy guns and howitzers. — Ed.]

[4] [Dr. John C. Warren owns a small oil-painting which is supposed to represent the burning of the town. An officer is directing an incendiary. Women are flying with affright. The story usually goes that some men landed from the war-ships to assist in starting the conflagration. The painting is thought to resemble Trumbull's style. Dr. H. J. Bigelow found it many years ago, labelled as a Trumbull and called "The Burning of Charlestown," in a dealer's shop in Boston, and gave it to Dr. J. Mason Warren. — Ed.]

[5] But never got them. The master of ordnance was "making love to the school-master's daughter." The guns were served with grape.

the burning town, moved to the attack a second time. The result in both attacks was the same as before. Colonel Prescott thought it even more destructive than at first. The officers remonstrated; even goaded the men with their swords. The dead in some cases lay within a few yards of the works. Putnam said: "I never saw such carnage." Howe, who had promised his men to march at their head, held his promise. He bore a charmed life. Three times he was left alone. In the several attacks made by his column, one company of the Fifty-second lost every man as killed or wounded. The English broke so completely that the fugitives filled the boats. For a considerable time no further attack was made. Many of the American officers thought the day was their own; but the regiments ordered from Cambridge, to reinforce them, did not arrive. After the battle several officers were tried for cowardice on account of their slowness in bringing relief at this time. Howe sent for reinforcements. Four hundred marines, under Small, were sent to him; and with them came General Clinton. But for this help he would have lost the battle.[1]

Howe now, for the first time, bade his men lay aside their knapsacks, move in columns, and trust to the bayonets. More important was the discovery which he had made, with a soldier's eye, that the north end of the breastwork was uncovered, and his resolution to advance his field-pieces far enough to rake it. He made this his object now, only demonstrating against the terrible fence on the American left, without approaching it; and, with these skilful dispositions, moved forward on both attacks for the third time. They were wholly successful. Howe himself led the attack on the breastwork. Prescott recognized him, and was soldier enough to know it would succeed; but he held and encouraged his men. Few of them had three rounds of powder left, but he instructed them to hold their fire till the British were within twenty yards. This they did, and the enemy faltered under the volley,[2] but reached the ramparts and were sheltered by them. Pitcairn, commanding the marines, was here mortally wounded. As, man by man, the Englishmen struggled over the redoubt,[3] Howe's artillery swept the breastwork which ran from it. His

[1] [Dr. John Jeffries crossed with the reinforcements of four hundred men that Gage sent over. See *N. E. Hist. and Geneal. Reg.*, Jan. 1861, p. 15. — Ed.]



[2] [General Greene, writing from the Roxbury Camp the next day (June 18), speaks of the repulse the third time, and adds a bit of camp gossip: "It is thought they would have gone off, but some of the Provincials imprudently called out to their officers that their powder was gone. The Regulars heard it, turned about, charged their bayonets, and forced the entrenchments." — Ed.]

[3] Lord Rawdon, who was one of them, and was afterward popularly and probably incorrectly said to have carried the colors, was afterward Earl of Moira, governor of India from 1812 to 1818, and a favorite of George IV.

[The reader is referred to the frontispiece for what is considered a contemporary view of the battle, as seen from Beacon Hill. The original sketch is in the possession of Dr. Thomas Addis Emmet, of New York, and was first brought to the attention of the public in *Harper's Monthly*, in 1875.

The designer for the cut followed a careful

leading companies soon passed round its northern end. Prescott, to avoid being shut in, gave the order to retreat. Most of his men had fired every round of powder.

The retreating men passed between two successful English columns, which hardly dared fire, however, as their own friends were mingled with their enemies. Yet Warren was killed at this juncture, Gridley wounded, as was Bridge, also, for the second time.

The rail-fence, where Stark commanded, had not been attacked seriously. The men here held their ground, and covered the retreat of their

tracing of it which was kindly lent by Mr. Benson J. Lossing.

The spectator is supposed to be on Beacon Hill, one hundred and thirty-eight feet above the sea, and the higher hill, Bunker Hill, beyond which the white smoke rises, is one hundred and ten feet high, and a little less than a mile and a half distant. Breed's Hill, where the redoubt is, is sixty-two feet above the sea. The two summits were one hundred and thirty rods apart.

Frothingham, *Siege of Boston*, p. 121, gives a profile view of the Charlestown peninsula at this time, copied from a contemporary drawing. It is reproduced by Lossing in his *Field-Book*, and in Bryant and Gay's *United States*, iii. 377. The *Pennsylvania Magazine*, September, 1775, has a folding "very elegant engraving of the late battle at Charlestown, June 17, 1775," as the title-page describes it. Barnard's *New Complete and Authentic History of England* has a "view of the attack on Bunker's Hill, with the burning of

AFTER THE BATTLE.

The annexed cut is from the same source. The redoubt is seen on the top of the hill; and of the broken fences a British account says: "These posts and rails were too strong for the columns to push down, and the march was so retarded by getting over them, that the next morning they were found studded with bullets, not a hand's breadth from each other."

These sketches were taken for Lord Rawdon, then on Gage's staff, and remained in the possession of his descendants till the dispersion of the late Marquis of Hastings's library, when they were bought by Dr. Emmet.

Charlestown, June 17, 1775;" drawn by Mr. Millar; engraved by Lodge ($11\frac{1}{2} \times 8$ inches). There is a view of the hill-top, with the monument erected on Bunker Hill by the Freemasons to the memory of Warren in 1794, in the *Analectic Magazine*, March, 1818; and it is reproduced in the *Mass. Hist. Soc. Proc.*, 1875, p. 65. A view of the monument only is given in Snow's *History of Boston*, p. 309; and one is also given in the frontispiece of the present volume. Other early views of the battle are described in Winsor's *Readers' Handbook of the American Revolution*, p. 58. — Ed.]

less successful comrades. They were withdrawn in regular order, after the fugitives from the redoubt passed them. At the summit of Bunker Hill, Putnam attempted to rally the army behind the works he had been building. He stood by a cannon till the bayonets were almost upon him; but the retreat could not be checked, and the English troops in triumph took possession of the hill about five o'clock in the afternoon.



Clinton advised Howe to push on to Cambridge. Ward, on his part, dreaded such an attack; but Howe satisfied himself with turning two field-pieces on the retiring enemy.

Prescott was mad with disappointment. He reported to Ward, and told him that with three fresh regiments, with bayonets and powder, he would take the hill again; but Ward was only too well pleased if he were left without attack.[1] Ward knew, what he would not tell to any man even to save his reputation, that he had in store that day only sixty-nine hundred pounds of powder, — not half a pound for every soldier in his command.

It was hardly an hour and a half between the first attack and the victorious capture of the summit of Bunker Hill. In that period the attacking force had lost two hundred and twenty-four killed, and eight hundred and thirty wounded. If, as Gage said, he had about two thousand men in the attack, this would have been a loss of more than one half the force; but in fact his full force was somewhat larger than this. Of the killed and wounded, one hundred and fifty-seven were officers. The American loss was one hundred and fifty killed, two hundred and seventy wounded, and thirty taken prisoners.[2]

The impression then made on Howe and Clinton governed them through the war. They never again led troops against intrenched men. It will be found thus that this first battle, in the terrible lesson it taught, was really the battle decisive of the seven years which followed.[3] We now know that the English officers thought their privates misbehaved. It is certain that in many instances they ran, — even to their boats. But when one reads that every man was killed or wounded in one company, he does not ask many questions as to the courage of the survivors. Burgoyne says in a private letter to Lord Rochford: "All the wounds of the officers were not received

[1] [The apprehension that the result of the battle would instigate Gage to send a force to disperse the Provincial Congress, is shown by an order passed at Watertown, June 18, directing the secretary to look after the records and papers of that body, and to have a horse ready "for that purpose in any emergency." (*Massachusetts Archives*, cxxxviii. p. 159.) "It is expected they will come out over the Neck to-night, and a dreadful battle must ensue." — Abigail Adams to John Adams, June 18, 1775. — Ed.]

[2] ["Our prisoners were brought over to the Long Wharf, and there lay all night, without any care of their wounds, or any resting place but the pavements, until the next day, when they exchanged it for the jail, since which we hear they are civilly treated." — Abigail Adams to John Adams, July 5, 1775. The Congress at Watertown, June 27, 1775, requested General Thomas "to supply our wounded friends in Boston, prisoners, with fresh meat, in case he can convey it to them and to them only." — *Massachusetts Archives*, cxxxviii. p. 174. — Ed.]

[3] [Creasy, *Decisive Battles of the World*, gives Saratoga that pre-eminence; but Washington at once recognized the importance of Bunker Hill.

from the enemy;" but he begs that this shall not pass, even in a whisper, to any but the king.

All that night and all the next day, carts, wagons, and chaises, bearing wounded men, were passing from the wharves to hospitals, barracks, and lodging-houses. The tradition of the next generation told ghastly stories of blood trickling on the pavement from the wagons which bore wounded men.

A hot summer followed upon this battle-day, which was the hottest of all. Washington, on July 3, beneath the now historic elm, took the command of the American army, and made his headquarters for a few days in the house belonging to the president of the college; he then moved them to the famous mansion now the home of Longfellow. The blockade by land became closer than ever. Privateers audaciously cut off vessels approaching with stores.[1] While few of those events passed which work their way into general history, or even light up historical novels, the diaries and letters of the time show that there was not a week without its subject for excitement or, at least, conversation.[2]

On July 12, Major Greaton, of Roxbury, burned the hay which the English had made on Long Island. On the twentieth, Major Vose of Heath's regiment dismantled and burned the light-house, and made a raid on Point Shirley. Another party, under Major Tupper, afterward drove off the force which tried to rebuild it.[3] On July 11, Lee, in Cambridge, began a correspondence with Burgoyne; the first in a series of flirtations with old loves, which ripened into treason. Desertions from Gage's army, which on October 10 became Howe's, were not frequent. Howe says that they lost

[1] [Washington early commissioned (October, 1775) John Manly as captain, who sailing from Marblehead in the schooner "Lee," in November, 1775, captured military stores, which soon were in the Cambridge Camp. Washington had not long before written to Congress that the "fortunate capture of an ordnance ship would give new life to the camp." Manly died in 1793, in his house at the North End. There



is a portrait of him in Preble's *History of the Flag*. — Ed.] The earliest commission to privateers is dated September 2.

[2] "They carry off cattle under the guns of the fleet." — *Earl Percy to his father.*

[3] [The light-house, at this time standing at the harbor's entrance, was the original structure of 1716, modified somewhat by repairs in 1757, when it had been injured by fire. It became, early in the siege, an object of concern for both sides; and more than one expedition, conducted by the Provincials, destroyed the destructible parts of it. Washington, in general orders, Aug. 1, 1775, thanked Major Tupper and his men "for gallant and soldier-like behavior in possessing themselves of the enemy's posts at the light-house."

Details of various exploits in the harbor will be found in Frothingham's *Siege of Boston*, p. 110; *Evacuation Memorial*, p 142; Pattee's *History of Braintree and Quincy*. In the *Massachusetts Archives*, cxxxviii., are various statements of depredations of the Regulars upon stock and other property upon the islands. Such a schedule of property thus lost, by Joshua Henshaw of Boston, is at p. 415 of that volume. Major John Phillips, who was commander of the Castle from 1759, had surrendered the charge on Hutchinson's order, which in the summer of 1770 took it from the care of the Province and placed it in the keeping of the troops. The same officer was later made fort-major of the fortress. *Mass. Hist. Soc. Proc.*, February, 1872, p. 207. After the evacuation, Sept. 1, 1776, Lieut.-Colonel Revere was directed by General Heath to take command of Castle Island. *N. E. Hist. and Geneal. Reg.*, July, 1876. — Ed.]

but thirty-three men by desertion through the seven months after April 19. Of every one of these desertions the American accounts give some detail. Each deserter had his romance with which to gild his reception. One of them, in July, said that Gage had but nine hundred men well enough to be under arms.[1]

A private note from Putnam to Moncrieffe, an old fellow-soldier, accompanies a present of fresh meat, which Moncrieffe loyally sent to the hospitals. Before August was over, Gage was glad to renew the treaty for sending out the poor civilians from Boston; and he and Howe sent out several parties after this time. It will be remembered, however, that Boston was still a town of gardens, and that the people were not unused to providing their own summer vegetables from their own land. Gage made the admiral send marauding expeditions up and down the coast for sheep and other provisions; but even a raid of a thousand sheep went but little way in feeding twenty thousand hungry people.[2]

Dr. Andrew Eliot, who remained in town, in a letter of July 31, thanks his parishioner, Daniel Parker, for two quarters of fresh mutton which he had sent from Salem. He distributed broth from it to thirty or forty sick people. The writer of these lines, at this late day, expresses the thanks of his great-great-grandmother for her share. At an auction sale of oxen and sheep, picked up on the coast by the marauding navy, cattle brought from fifteen to thirty-four pounds, and sheep thirty shillings and upwards. To the Patriots these prices seemed enormous. As early as July the English had begun to kill their milch cows, and the beef was sold at forty or fifty cents the pound. In the winter a camp-follower named Winifred McOwen received one hundred lashes for killing the town bull and selling the beef.[3]

So soon as the Government received Gage's account of Bunker Hill he was recalled. It was under the pretence that he was to be sent back in the next spring; but really he was disgraced, and he was never appointed to command again.[4] Howe took the command. He and Gage had both recommended that Boston should be abandoned and New York taken instead. Lord Dartmouth, for the Government, expressed the same idea as

[1] [We have no estimate of the desertions from the American camp, but the British orderly-book notes their occurrence. This from Adjutant Waller's: —

"8 July, 1775. The advanced sentries not to suffer those of the rebels during the night to come forward from their day posts; if they see them advance, they must call and order them to return to their former station, which if they disobey, the sentries are immediately to inform the corporal of the guard of their having come forward: but they are not to fire unless they see occasion in their own defence, or to alarm the guard. The advanced guards and sentries are to fire on any of the rebels they perceive endeavoring to prevent deserters coming in."

Lists of deserters from Massachusetts regiments for the later period, 1777–80, are in *Mass. Revolutionary Rolls*, ix. But these men did not, like the English, pass over to the enemy. — Ed.]

[2] "And what have you got, by all your designing,
But a town, without dinner, to sit down and dine in?" — *Ballad of the Time.*

[3] [Forage became scarce by midsummer in 1775. We find in Waller's orderly-book: —

"19 July, 1775. The officers of the army are desired to send their horses to grass at Charlestown, as they cannot at present be supplied with forage."

Major Donkin, in his *Military Collections*, p. 113, says: "Cæsar, in the African war, fed his cavalry with sea-wrack, or jingle, washed well in fresh water. This might have been a good substitute for hay at Boston, which was very scarce in 1775." — Ed.]

[4] [Gage sailed for England, Oct. 10, 1775. *Mass. Hist. Soc. Proc.*, 1876, p. 316. General W.

early as September. When Howe was afterward asked why he did not then abandon Boston, he said he had no transports; but he had as many in October as he had in the next March, when the evacuation came.[1]

A census, taken by Gage's order in July, showed a civilian population of 6,573. The army was then 13,500 strong. The privates were a wretched set. The sternest discipline did not keep them in order. Irish in large numbers, Scotch, German, and English were cooped up together. Thefts, robberies, and nameless insults were daily perpetrated. As early as the sixth of June, Waller's orderly-book contains this order: "The commanding officer [Percy] observes such profligacy and dissipation and want of subordination, that he orders a roll to be called four times a day." In a week, — "he is sorry to take notice that the tents and camp furniture are in the most shameful and filthy condition." Drunkenness and licentiousness were not checked by such punishments as eight hundred and a thousand lashes, inflicted by order of courts-martial. Five hundred lashes were very frequent. Indeed, the cat was in use daily. Winifred McOwen, the woman spoken of above as killing the bull, was sentenced to receive her hundred lashes on the bare back, in the most public places of the town.

The civilian population was steadily decreasing by death, and the occasional parties sent out by the English generals.[2] On September 27 news came of a change of the admiral, and of more reinforcements. In October, so anxious was the dread of attack, that for several nights the army was held in readiness to resist it. As winter came on, many houses before exempted were seized for barracks. As late as November 9, some of the regiments were under canvas. On November 19 a ship arrived with fowls, sheep, etc., probably the only arrival of the large stores of this kind shipped from England. Late in November, Manly, in an American privateer, took the "Nancy," an ordnance ship, with large stores of ammunition. Howe wrote home that now the rebels had the means to burn the town he was afraid they would do so, and the contemporary correspondence is full of proposals "to smoke out the pirates."

The "pirates" made themselves as comfortable as they could. Some of the old historical buildings were burned for firewood, — Winthrop's house, alas! among them, and no one, in a hundred and fifty years, had made a picture of it. Some of the grenadiers were quartered in the West Church. Two regiments of infantry were in Brattle Street meeting-house,[3] and in

H. Sumner married a niece of Gage, and came into possession of an original portrait of him, which he had engraved for his *History of East Boston*, and bequeathed to the State. It is now in the State Library. — Ed.]

[1] [Howe kept up an occasional cannonading; but he made no threatening movement for a month, till, November 9, he sent a raiding party to Lechmere point to steal cattle, which failed of its purpose. Moore's *Diary of the American Revolution*, i. 166. — Ed.]

[2] [Howe issued a proclamation, October 28, 1775, forbidding specie, beyond five pounds, to be carried out of Boston by any one departing. — Ed.]

[3] [It is but a few years since this old landmark disappeared, which

> "Wore on its bosom, as a bride might do,
> The iron breastpin which the rebels threw,"

as Holmes phrases it. The ball, thrown from the Cambridge shore, hit the front and fell to the pavement, and was subsequently picked up and lodged in the place where it struck. A model

the sugar-house adjoining it. "The pillars saved" the church from being a riding school, as the record says with reference to the "Pillar of fire." The Old South meeting-house was used for a riding school by the Seventeenth Dragoons. The officers still had their horses, and they got up sleighing parties within the narrow limits of the town, as winter closed in.[1] The king's birthday was celebrated with enthusiasm. Even Patriots still pretended that it was the ministry they were fighting, and drank the health of the king, who was really their most bigoted enemy. The Patriot gentlemen made a point of maintaining the most sedulous outward courtesy to the officers of their king. Faneuil Hall was at first used as a storehouse for furniture and other property; but it was cleaned out for a theatre when General Burgoyne, and his friends among the officers, needed it for that purpose. In September they performed *Zara*, a tragedy translated from Voltaire, and not yet wholly forgotten, thanks to Miss Edgeworth's *Helen*. Burgoyne wrote the prologue and epilogue. The female parts were taken by Boston young ladies, whose names have not come down to us. The play was repeated several times, the profits being devoted to the widows and children of the soldiers. Burgoyne has the credit of writing another play, *The Blockade of Boston*, which was performed after he had sailed for home. It was on January 8, when this play was in full progress, and an actor ridiculing General Washington was on the stage, that a sergeant rushed in, crying: "The Yankees are attacking the works on Bunker Hill." This seemed a part of the play, till the highest officer present, an aide-de-camp,[2] ordered, "Officers to their posts!" The play was at an end. Major Knowlton, who had commanded at the rail-fence on the day of the battle, had renewed his visit to Bunker Hill, burned a bakehouse and some other buildings, and carried off several prisoners.[3] The Patriot ladies, who had refused to go to the play, made merry over the misadventures of their less squeamish sisters, who had to come home, frightened, without their gallant escorts.

General Sullivan had attempted this raid the week before, but had been disappointed because the ice was not strong enough to bear his men. The mildness of the winter caused constant annoyance to Washington, who was now provided with ammunition, and was eager to cross the ice on the Back Bay and attack the town. He had insulted it by floating batteries once or twice, but with no serious attack.[4] Why Howe, fairly crowded as he was, had never renewed his own plan for taking Dorchester Heights, does not appear; but in February, 1776, he writes to Lord Dartmouth:[5] —

of the old meeting-house, showing the ball in place, is now in the gallery of the Historical Society. — Ed.]

[1] Hon. J. T. Austin's MS. notes.

[2] Not General Howe, as an exaggerated tradition has it.

[3] [See contemporary accounts given in Moore's *Diary of the American Revolution*, i. 193, 199. — Ed.]

[4] [Abigail Adams writes, Oct. 21, 1775: "A floating battery of ours went out two nights ago, and moved near the town, and then discharged their guns. Some of the balls went into the Workhouse; some through the tents in the Common; and one through the sign of the Lamb Tavern." — Ed.]

[5] MS. despatch, preserved in the state-paper office, London.

"It being ascertained that the enemy intended to take possession of Dorchester Height or Neck, a detachment was ordered from Castle William on the 13th of February under the command of Lieut.-Colonel Leslie, and another of grenadiers and light infantry commanded by Major Musgrave, with directions to pass on ice, and destroy every house and every kind of cover on that peninsula, — which was executed, and six of the enemy's guard taken prisoners."

From this despatch it appears that the ice had at last formed, for which Washington had been waiting. He at once called a council of war, and urged an assault on the town by crossing over the ice from Cambridge and Roxbury; but his field-officers generally were unfavorable to the enterprise, much to Washington's disgust and hardly concealed indignation, and he therefore reluctantly abandoned it. In its place he made immediate dispositions to seize Dorchester Heights and to take Noddle's Island, now known as East Boston. He asked the government of Massachusetts to call out the militia of the neighborhood. This was done, and ten regiments were called in. Washington himself says: "These men came in at the appointed time, and manifested the greatest alertness and determined resolution to act like men engaged in the cause of freedom."

Preparations were at once made by General Ward, at Roxbury, in collecting fascines, and what in the military language of that day were called "chandeliers," a kind of foundation for the fascines, with which were to be built the works on Dorchester Heights. The ground was supposed to be frozen too hard for entrenching. On Saturday, Sunday, and Monday nights, March 2, 3, and 4, 1776, a cannonading was kept up from Cobble Hill, Lechmere's Point, and Lamb's Dam in Roxbury, to divert the attention of the English troops and drown the noise of carts crossing the frozen ground. As soon as the firing began on Monday evening, General Thomas moved from Roxbury to South Boston with twelve hundred men. To deaden the noise of the wagons the men strewed the road with straw, and wound wisps about the wheels. Before morning they had thrown up formidable works. The English of the fleet and of the army were entirely surprised when that morning broke, for a dense fog had favored the Americans at their work. On Tuesday evening, intending to storm the newly built works, Howe sent down three thousand men under Percy to the Castle, to attack on that side; but while his troops were embarking from the island a violent storm came up, which lasted till eight o'clock the next day and wholly broke up the design. Before night of the sixth, evacuation was determined on. Percy's letter to his father, of that date, says: "It is determined to evacuate this town. I believe Halifax is to be our destination." He then knew, and Howe had determined, that the works on Dorchester Heights were not to be stormed. "An officer of distinction," in Almon's *Remembrancer* at the same date, says: "We are evacuating the town with the utmost expedition, and are leaving behind half our worldly goods. Adieu! I hope to embark in a few hours."

From hour to hour, however, Thomas was strengthening his works, which

GENERAL HENRY KNOX.[1]

were now much stronger and better provided than were Prescott's works at Bunker Hill. Knox's Ticonderoga cannon were likely to be in good service.

[1] [A likeness of Knox is prefixed to the *Life* of him by Samuel A. Drake. A photogravure of what is called the panel likeness of Knox, by Stuart, is given in Mason's *Stuart*, p. 211. The Knox papers, left to the New England Historic Genealogical Society by the late Admiral Thatcher, grandson of the general, are now arranged in fifty-five folio volumes, to which an index is preparing. A brief account of the papers (11,464 in all), prepared by the Rev. E. F. Slafter, has been printed by the society.

Knox played an important part in the siege by conducting the expedition from Cambridge to Ticonderoga to get some of the cannon which had fallen into Ethan Allen's and Arnold's hands by the capture of that post, and which Washington needed to put in his batteries, and which were opportunely at hand when the heights at Dorchester Neck were to be fortified. Knox's diary of this expedition is in the *N. E. Hist. and Geneal. Reg.*, July, 1876. An inventory of the cannon, made Dec. 10, 1775, is given in Drake's

Had the attack been made, Washington relied upon Thomas to hold the Heights, and he would himself have assaulted Boston on the western side as soon as the English troops were engaged at South Boston. He had, at the mouth of the Charles River, two divisions of troops in readiness, numbering four thousand men, under the command of Greene and of Sullivan. Greene's division was to have landed near where the Massachusetts General Hospital grounds now are, and Sullivan's further south at the powder house, and to seize the hill on the Common. If they were successful, these divisions were to unite, march upon the English works at the Neck, and let in the troops from Roxbury. Three floating batteries were to clear the way in advance for their landing.

Washington thought well of this enterprise, and the troops would have certainly been well led; but it will never be known how far this attack of four thousand men, who were to row two miles and land under fire from the English batteries, would have succeeded.

It was only twelve months after Warren's last address in the Old South. Washington, in his general orders, alludes to the anniversary of the Massacre.[1] But as the English did not attack on their side, the American attack did not take place. Thomas kept on strengthening his works. Washington regarded this fortification as only preliminary to taking Nook's Hill. This hill was the extreme northwest part of South Boston, and commanded the south end of Boston proper. It is now wholly dug away.[2]

The details were made for the occupation of this lesser hill on the night of the ninth. It was, so to speak, the Breed's Hill of Dorchester, — the eminence nearer to the town. But on the eighth Howe sent out a flag of truce, with a letter signed by John Scollay, Timothy Newell, Thomas Marshall, and Samuel Austin, the selectmen of the town. It was addressed to nobody, for Howe had made a point that these gentlemen should not address "His Excellency George Washington," as they wished to do. The letter stated officially that Howe had assured them that he was making his preparations to withdraw, and that he would not injure the town unless he was molested in withdrawing. Washington would not answer. Colonel Learned, who received the paper, sent back a message that Washington would take no notice of it; that it was an unauthenticated paper, not obligatory upon General Howe. This was all the communication which passed; but it was enough. The Patriots were only too glad to have the "pyrates"

Cincinnati Society, p. 544. See also Drake's *Life of Knox*, p. 175; his *Landmarks of Middlesex*, p. 154; Frothingham's *Siege of Boston*, p. 295. After the war Knox became a resident, for a time, of Boston, and occupied the Copley house on Beacon Hill. The mansion which he built, later, at Thomaston, Me., is figured in *Scribner's Monthly*, ix. 616. A brother of General Knox (Thomas Knox) was the first keeper of Boston Light, when it was rebuilt after the war. Carter's *Summer Cruise*, p. 24. — Ed.]

[1] [While this fortifying was going on at Dorchester Neck, a scene of solemnity, not unmixed with ludicrous associations, took place at Watertown. A meeting of the citizens of Boston had been legally warned to listen there to an anniversary oration on the Massacre. The Rev. Peter Thacher delivered it, and the audience of supposable Bostonians applauded it. — Ed.]

[2] [It is shown on Pelham's map, of which a heliotype is given in the Introduction to this volume, — there called "Foster's Hill." — Ed.]

embark; and nothing would have justified any loss of life or of property in hurrying them.[1] On the 7th Manly took two more provision ships in the bay, and carried them into the harbor of Cape Ann. On Saturday night, the 9th, a ball from the English killed Dr. Dole and three men who had made a fire on Nook's Hill. Sunday and Monday the bombardment continued. On the next Sunday morning, the 17th, Howe, with his whole army, sailed in seventy-eight vessels. The total number of officers and men, on his returns, was eight thousand nine hundred and six. The refugees who accompanied him were nine hundred and twenty-four more, who registered their names at Halifax, and some two hundred who made no registry there. In more than one case, after the fleet had come out into the bay, a sea-sick Tory's wife begged her husband to put back; and, by this chance, her family landed on the shore of Massachusetts, to be progenitors of sturdy Republicans, and not, as might have been, of Nova Scotians, loyal to Victoria.

BY HIS EXCELLENCY

WILLIAM HOWE,

MAJOR GENERAL, &c. &c. &c.

AS Linnen and Woolen Goods are Articles much wanted by the Rebels, and would aid and aſſiſt them in their Rebellion, the Commander in Chief expects that all good Subjects will uſe their utmoſt Endeavors to have all ſuch Articles convey'd from this Place: Any who have not Opportunity to convey their Goods under their own Care, may deliver them on Board the Minerva at Hubbard's Wharf, to *Crean Bruſh*, Eſq; mark'd with their Names, who will give a Certificate of the Delivery, and will oblige himſelf to return them to the Owners, all unavoidable Accidents accepted.

If after this Notice any Perſon ſecretes or keeps in his Poſſeſſion ſuch Articles, he will be treated as a Favourer of Rebels.

Boſton, March 10th. 1776.

HOWE'S PROCLAMATION.[2]

[1] "Last Friday," writes Major Judah Alden to his father, "the selectmen of Boston sent out a letter to General Washington, to desire him not to molest General Howe when he quit the town, as they had assurance from him that he would leave the town standing, and all private property. By their [the enemy's] motions, it looks as if they were determined to quit. They have loaded every vessel in the harbor, but what their design is we do not know. It is generally thought that they are not determined to go, but to make us think so until they can get reinforcements. We are making all preparations against them that we possibly can, and keep a better lookout than usual. General Washington's answer to the selectmen of Boston was, as there was nothing binding from General Howe, he should pay no regard to his promises to them."

[2] [This is a reduced *fac-simile* of an original broadside in the Massachusetts Historical Society's Library, and indicates the measures in preparation for the evacuation. Crean Brush was an Irishman who had gained notoriety in New York politics. Under cover of this proclamation, he broke open stores and dwellings, and conveyed the plunder to the "Minerva." He was captured on board his vessel after the evacuation, and lodged in Boston jail, where, in 1777, he was joined by his wife; and, in a disguise which her garments furnished, he escaped, Nov. 5, 1777, and fled to New York. See the *Evacuation Memorial*, p. 164. — Ed.]



WASHINGTON AT DORCHESTER HEIGHTS.[1]

[1] [This portrait of "Washington at Dorchester Heights," as it is called, was painted by Stuart in nine days, in 1806, following the so-called Athenæum head, which was depicted twenty years later than the event it is here made to commemorate. The story of this larger picture, told in Mason's *Stuart*, p. 103, is as follows: Winstanley, the painter, brought to Boston a copy which he had made in London of the Lansdowne likeness of Washington, painted just before the Athenæum head. Mr. Samuel Parkman advanced the copyist some money on this canvas, which, not being redeemed, was offered by him to the town for its acceptance. At the meeting when this offer was made, a blacksmith objected to the town's receiving a copy after Stuart, when



the artist lived among them and could give an original. This seemed a pertinent objection, and Mr. Parkman commissioned Stuart to paint the larger picture, which was then accepted by the town, and remained for many years in Faneuil Hall. It is now in the Art Museum. Before painting it, Stuart worked out the design on a smaller canvas,—or it is so claimed; and a "small full-length," sold by Stuart to Isaac P. Davis, and now owned by Mr. Ignatius Sargent, of Brookline, is called this sketch. Mason's *Stuart*, p. 105. — Ed.]

[1] [The annexed *fac-simile* is of a pen-and-ink sketch made by Kosciusko at Valley Forge in 1777. Alden was born in Duxbury, Oct. 3, 1750; was ensign in Cotton's regiment in 1775; lieutenant in Bailey's in 1776; later, captain and brevetted major, after service throughout the war. Francis S. Drake's *Memorials of the Society of the Cincinnati of Massachusetts*, p. 210, of which Major Alden was president from 1829 till his death, in 1845. He was with his regiment at Roxbury during the siege.

After the news came of the defeat of Montgomery at Quebec, Colonel Learned, accompanied by Alden, was sent to the British lines with a flag of truce. Alden at another time accompanied Colonel Tupper, under orders from Gen-

The siege was ended; and Congress, March 25, 1776, ordered and had struck a beautiful gold medal as a gift to Washington. It bears the mottoes: "Hostibus primo Fugatis," and "Bostonium Recuperatum."[1]

General Artemas Ward commanded the right wing of the American army, and directed the work of fortifying Dorchester Heights. General John Thomas carried out his orders with such resource and promptness as made the work the wonder of the time. And yet to-day, if you should ask ten Boston men, "Who was Artemas Ward?" nine would say he was an amusing showman. If you asked, "Who was John Thomas?" nine would say he was a flunky commemorated by Thackeray. On the site of the fortification — ordered by Washington, directed by Ward, and built by Thomas — is a memorial-stone which bears, not their names, but that of the mayor of Boston who erected it. Such is fame![2]

Edward E. Hale

eral Thomas, in whale-boats, to dislodge some British who had seized an island in Quincy Bay. The enemy fled on their approach. There are particulars about the Grape Island affair, and the general alarm along the southern shores of the harbor, in *The Familiar Letters of John and Abigail Adams.* — Ed.]

[1] [A heliotype *fac-simile* is given herewith. Washington's reply to the letter of presentation is given in *fac-simile* in Force's *American Archives*, fourth series, v. 977. The die, made in France, is still preserved, and coppers struck with it are not uncommon; but impressions taken since it has been repaired can be distinguished by one less leg of the horses being discernible, and by other marks. See Loubat's *Medallic History of the United States*, and Snowden's *Medals of Washington;* and particularly the description by Mr. William S. Appleton in the *Mass. Hist. Soc. Proc.*, April, 1874, p. 289. The original gold medal had come down through the descendants of Washington's elder brother; and, after having been buried, to escape capture during the late civil war, in the cellar of an old mansion in the Shenandoah Valley, a representative of the family sold it in the spring of 1876 to fifty gentlemen of Boston, headed by the Hon. Robert C. Winthrop, who presented it, during the Centennial ceremonies of March 17 of that year, to the city, to be preserved in the Public Library, where, with all the papers of attestation, it now is. See *Public Library Report* of that year; the *Evacuation Memorial*, p. 25, where a steel outline-engraving of it is given, from the plate used in Sparks's *Washington;* and *Mass. Hist. Soc. Proc.*, 1876, p. 230. The heliotype here given is from an early silver copy, belonging to Dr. Samuel A. Green.

There were eleven different medals struck in Paris, between 1776 and 1786, commemorative of events of the Revolution, and by order of Congress. The French Government, acting, it is said, under the prompting of Lafayette, presented the entire series, in silver, to Washington, and the collection is known as "the Washington medals;" and the same finally coming into the hands of Daniel Webster, passed, after Webster's decease, to the Hon. Peter Harvey, who presented them to the Massachusetts Historical Society, where they now are. See the *Proceedings*, April, 1874. — Ed.] "Bostonium" in later Latin has given way to "Bostonia." The caricatures of the times speak of the people as "Bostoneers."

[2] The admirable Centennial Address of Dr. Ellis, and its full appendix, give very full memoranda of the details of the siege and its results. [It may be worth while to note the subsequent careers of the leading British generals. Gage, after his return to England, became inconspicuous, and died April 2, 1787. Howe's subsequent career further south only gained for him criticism and inquiry, till he returned to England in 1777 (where he died in 1814); to be succeeded by Clinton, who held the command till 1782, when he in turn returned to England, and died in 1795. Burgoyne's surrender at Saratoga led to his detention in Boston and Cambridge, from which he also returned to England, to enter Parliament and advise a cessation of hostilities, dying finally in 1792. *Siege of Boston*, p. 334. — Ed.]

HOSTIBUS FUGATIS

GEORGIO WASHINGTON SPRETIS DEI EXERCITUM ADSERTORI LIBERTATIS
SENATUS AMERICANUS

SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES BY THE EDITOR.

PAUL REVERE'S LANTERNS. — The story of the lanterns has of late years attracted a good deal of attention. Richard Devens, the friend with whom it is claimed Paul Revere had agreed upon this method of notice, made record of it



some time after in some minutes, which were not brought to light till Mr. Frothingham printed them in 1849 (*Siege of Boston*, p. 57). The Devens memorandum is also given in Wheildon's *Revere's Signal Lanterns*, p. 13, who discredits it and disputes some of Frothingham's statements. In 1798, a letter from Revere to Dr. Belknap, detailing the events just before Lexington, was printed in *Mass. Hist. Coll.*, v.; it may possibly have been written a few, but probably not many, years earlier. It has since been reprinted more accurately in the same society's *Proceedings*, November, 1878, p. 371, from Revere's own manuscript, preserved in its cabinet. The story entered into all the histories; but first acquired wide popularity when Mr. Longfellow, in 1863, made it one of his *Tales of a Wayside Inn*, — departing, however, in his spirited verse, somewhat from the historical record, since Revere did not watch for the lanterns, and never reached Concord. Meanwhile no particular discrimination had been made in the printed accounts as to the edifice from which the lights were displayed. Both Devens and Revere had called it the North Church. Dr. Eaton, in his *Historical Discourse of Christ Church*, had made no mention of the story in 1824 as associated with that church; and though a tradition remained to fix upon that building the place of the signal's display, it was not publicly bruited till 1873, when the Rev. Dr. Henry Burroughs, its rector, in an historical discourse, claimed the connection of the incident with this church, and that Robert Newman, who was then its sexton, was the one who hung out the lanterns at Revere's instigation. Drake's *Landmarks*, p. 214, about the same time also gave the incident to Christ Church. A movement next on the part of the city authorities to commemorate the warning, by an inscription on this church, led to a protest, dated Dec. 28, 1876, from Richard Frothingham, *The Alarm on the Night of April 18, 1775*, in which he showed, as indeed Devens's account makes clear, that other warnings had been given before the lanterns were hung out, and which they only confirmed. Mr. Frothingham also claimed that the old North Meeting-house in North Square was the true place of their display, — a building which had been pulled down for fuel during the siege. This position was controverted by the Rev. John Lee Watson in a letter in the *Daily Advertiser*, July 20, 1876, which was subsequently printed, with comments by Charles Deane, in the *Mass. Hist. Soc. Proc.*, November, 1876; and separately, with a later letter dated March, 1879, in *Paul Revere's Signals*, New York, 1880. In these, both writer and commentator show conclusively that Christ Church was known popularly as the North Church, and they contend that it was from its spire the lights were shown. Mr. Watson also contends that the "friend" of Revere was a Boston merchant, Mr. John Pulling, a warden of the church; and that it was he who carried out Revere's plan. Mr. W. W. Wheildon, in his *Paul Revere's Signal Lanterns*, 1878, on the other hand, reiterates the claims of Newman, and, as well as Drake, — *Middlesex County*, p. 117, and *Landmarks of Middlesex*, p. 214, — supports the Christ Church view.

The present appearance of Christ Church is shown in Vol. II. p. 509. A tablet was placed on its front Oct. 17, 1878, with this inscription: "The signal lanterns of Paul Revere displayed in the steeple of this Church, April 18, 1775, warned the country of the march of the British troops to Lexington and Concord." The original spire was overthrown in the great gale of 1804, but a new one, built by Charles Bulfinch, preserved the proportions of the old one; this, however, has been somewhat changed by the placing of the clock, as will be seen by comparing the cut in Shaw's *Description of Boston*, p. 257. Mr. H. W. Holland's *William Dawes and his Ride with Paul Revere*, Boston, 1878, sets forth the particular services, at the same time, of Dawes.

LEXINGTON AND CONCORD. — Percy wrote a private letter the day after the fight, dated Boston, April 20, 1775, in which he says, speaking of his march: "I advanced to a town about twelve miles distant from Boston, before I could get the least intelligence, as all the houses were

shut up, and not the least appearance of an inhabitant to be seen." Then, speaking of his reaching Lexington, and training his cannon upon the Provincials, to gain "time for the grenadiers and light companies to form and retire in order," he says he "stopped the rebels for a little time, who dispersed directly and endeavored to surround us, for they were in great numbers, the whole country having been collected for above twenty miles round." "When the retreat began," he adds, "I ordered the grenadiers and light infantry to move off, covering them with my brigade, and detaching strong flanking parties, — which was absolutely necessary, as the whole country we had to retire through was covered with stone walls, and extended a very hilly strong country." He reports that they had "expended almost every cartridge" when they reached Charlestown, and had lost "65 killed, 157 wounded, and 21 missing, beside one officer killed, 15 wounded, and two wounded and taken prisoners. . . . This, however, was nothing like the number of which, from many circumstances, I have reason to believe were killed of the rebels." Of his adversaries he says: "Whoever looks upon them merely as an irregular mob will find himself much mistaken. They have men among them who know very well what they are about, having been employed as rangers against the Indians and Acadians; and this country, being much covered with wood and hilly, is very advantageous for their method of fighting. Nor are several of their men void of a spirit of enthusiasm, as we experienced yesterday; for many of them concealed themselves in houses, and advanced within ten yards to fire at me and other officers, though they were morally certain of being put to death. . . . You may depend upon it that as the rebels have now had time to prepare, they are determined to go through with it; nor will the insurrection here turn out so despicable as it is perhaps imagined at home. For my part I never believed, I confess, that they would have attacked the King's troops, or have had the perseverance I found in them yesterday." These extracts are from a *fac-simile* of the letter kindly lent by the Rev. E. G. Porter, of Lexington, supplied to him by the Duke of Northumberland, the grand-nephew of the Earl. The letter is more interesting than Percy's official report to Gage of the same date, which is printed in *Mass. Hist. Soc. Proc.*, May, 1876, p. 349.

The late Hon. Charles Hudson furnished to the *Mass. Hist. Soc. Proc.*, January, 1880, p. 315, a paper on Pitcairn, whose name, because of his alleged beginning of the contest at Lexington, has been usually shrouded with obloquy; but he is said to have been a fair-minded officer, much esteemed by all. (Sargent's *Dealings with the Dead*, No. 17.) The first shot, whether fired by Pitcairn or not, seems to have been from a pistol, — perhaps accidentally, — not with any execution so far as appears; but it was soon followed by a few muskets, and then by a volley of the British vanguard. Pitcairn and his officers aver that the first shot came from the Provincials. (See Stiles's Diary, quoted in Frothingham's *Siege of Boston*, p. 62; and Irving's *Washington*.) The Provincials, scores of them, report that it came from the Regulars. Neither side intended to fire first, and it is not easy to determine to whose door what was probably an accidental discharge is to be laid. There has been some discussion as to the person who first shed British blood. (*Magazine of American History*, April, 1880, p. 308.) At all events, it may be worth while in passing to note that these "embattled farmers" stood where the parallel lines are marked on the annexed plan of the triangular Lexington Green; which also shows where Percy planted his cannon to keep the Provincials at bay, while Smith's retiring force sought shelter in the opened ranks



of Percy's detachment. The royal side professed not to look upon the affair as we are accustomed to now-a-days. "Each side is ready to swear the other fired first," says a letter of the time, describing the after effects in Boston. "The country-people call this a victory, and the retreat of the troops a precipitate flight. They don't consider that when the King's troops had effected what they went for, they had only

to come home again." *Mass. Hist. Soc. Proc.*, 1873, p. 57.

Major Pitcairn, a few weeks later at Bunker Hill, fell back into his son's arms as he was scaling the redoubt, shot by a negro, — Peter Salem. (See George Livermore's "Historical Research" in *Mass. Hist. Soc. Proc.*, August, 1862, p. 176.) He was brought over the ferry to Mr. Stoddard's, near the landing, and here bled to death. His remains were placed under Christ Church; and the story goes that when, some years after, they were sought to be sent to his relatives in England, another body, through the difficulties of identification, was sent instead. Drake's *Landmarks*, p 217.

The reader must seek detailed accounts of this eventful day in Frothingham's *Siege of Boston*, and in the smaller monographs and incidental accounts, of which full enumeration is given in Winsor's *Readers' Handbook of the Revolution*, pp. 26–33; and in J. L. Whitney's *Literature of the Nineteenth April*, 1775. Gage's public statement is given in the *fac-simile* of his "Circumstantial Account" in the present chapter, which is not, by the way, accurately nor wholly reprinted in *Mass. Hist. Coll.*, ii.; nor in *The Cambridge of* 1776, p. 103. Percy's account and Smith's report are in *Mass. Hist. Soc. Proc.*, May, 1876; and Smith's is also in Mahon's *England*, vi. app.; and in *Mass. Hist. Soc. Proc.*, May, 1876, p. 350. It is interesting to compare the account given in the *Memoir and Letters of Captain W. G. Evelyn*, Oxford, 1879, pp. 53, 121.

The Provincial Congress, on its side, issued a *Narrative of the Incursions*, etc., — which was printed in its journal, also separately by Isaiah Thomas, and often since, — and took numerous depositions of participants in the fight, the principal men, like Colonel Barrett, deposing separately, — the originals of which, or those sent to England, are preserved in the libraries of Harvard College and the University of Virginia. They have been often printed. These, with other papers, were entrusted to Richard Derby, of Salem, and he despatched Captain John Derby with them on a swift vessel, so that the provincial accounts of the day's work reached London and the Government eleven days in advance of Gage's despatches. *Mass. Hist. Soc. Proc.*, April, 1858; *Siege of Boston*, p. 86. What are called the Lexington alarm rolls, or the lists of minute-men who turned out as the news spread, are contained in *Massachusetts Revolutionary Rolls*, xi.–xvi., with indexes.







THE LITERATURE OF BUNKER HILL. — This is voluminous, and is set forth on different plans in Winsor's *Readers' Handbook of the American Revolution*, pp. 35–59; and in J. F. Hunnewell's *Bibliography of Charlestown and Bunker Hill*, pp. 13–29. It is enough to mention here, of the more extended accounts, that in Frothingham's *Siege of Boston*, Dawson's in an extra number of the *Historical Magazine*, June, 1868, and that of Dr. George E. Ellis. Colonel Prescott wrote a brief and unsatisfactory account in the following August, addressed to John Adams, which is printed by Frothingham and Dawson; and his son, Judge Prescott, wrote a narrative, which represents presumably the views of Prescott, and which Frothingham printed in his centennial account of the battle, and in the *Mass. Hist. Soc. Proc.*, 1875. Two contemporary accounts are preserved from eye-witnesses on opposing sides, and from opposite points of view. Burgoyne saw the battle from Copp's Hill and described it in a letter to Lord Stanley, which is printed in Fonblanque's *Burgoyne* and in other places. The Rev. Peter Thacher, of Malden, saw it from the farther side of the Mystic, and wrote an account which is preserved in the American Antiquarian Society's Library, and is printed by Dawson. This was the basis of the narrative set forth by the Provincial Congress, which is printed by Frothingham and others. Gage's official report was printed in Almon's *Remembrancer*.

The earliest anniversary oration was Josiah Bartlett's, in 1794, which was printed the next year in Boston by B. Edes.

The bibliographical history of a somewhat needless controversy, which at one time was mixed with political recriminations, as to the command in a battle which was too unexpected and unorganized for any individual and regular management of the whole extent of it, is traced in Winsor's *Handbook*, p. 48. There can be no question of Prescott's military superiority at the redoubt; all else was supplementary, contingent certainly, but mainly independent, though a par-

tial concert of action obtained throughout the day, rather by mutual apprehension of the necessities of the case than by fixed direction.

In the parade at the time of laying the corner-stone of the monument in 1825 one hundred and ninety Revolutionary soldiers appeared; and of these, forty professed to have been in the battle. Under the fervor of the hour, some of these were appealed to to revive their recollections, and a mass of depositions were taken by William Sullivan and others; but those instrumental in procuring them soon became satisfied that such "old men's tales" drew more on the imagination than was fit for historical evidence. Colonel Swett, however, used them to some degree in the additions which he made to his account of the battle. These papers, in 1842, were for a while in the hands of a committee of the Historical Society, who saw no reason to value them differently; and being returned to the Sullivan family, it is supposed that they were destroyed. (*Mass. Hist. Soc. Proc.*, ii. 224–231.) Some papers, presumably of the same character, were offered at auction in New York in 1877; but without finding a purchaser. There is an amusing account of one of the so-called veterans of Bunker Hill in No. 1 of the "Recollections of American Society," in *Scribner's Monthly*, January, 1881, p. 420. Numerous papers relating to individual losses at Bunker Hill are in *Massachusetts Archives*, cxxxix.; and papers relating to the official return of the damage done by the burning of Charlestown, communicated to the Governor Jan. 11, 1783, are in *Massachusetts Archives*, cxxxviii. 393. So late as 1834 memorials were presented to the Legislature, asking satisfaction for losses suffered on June 17, 1775. See *House Document* of that year, No. 55.

THE AMERICAN LINES. — These can be traced in Pelham's *Boston and Vicinity*, and Trumbull's *Boston and the Surrounding Country*; both of which are given in reduced fac-simile in this volume, and are noted in the Introduction, together with various eclectic maps of a later day, useful in fixing the localities.

There were four points of attack which the besieging force guarded against: first, by Charlestown Neck, where the left wing, under Lee, would have to bear the brunt of the onset; second, by boats across the Back Bay, where the British would have to effect a landing in the face of the centre under Putnam; third, by a sortie from the Neck lines toward Roxbury; fourth, by Dorchester Neck, where, by landing on that peninsula, the enemy might attempt to turn the extreme right of the right wing. This part of the lines, both at Roxbury and Dorchester, was held by the right wing, which was commanded by Ward after Washington took the general command.

The fortified positions and associated landmarks along this line of circumvallation may perhaps be traced with interest

Going out over Charlestown Neck the road forked at the Common, just west of the narrowest part. The right hand fork came soon to Ploughed Hill, the modern Mount Benedict; and it was here that the Americans took an advanced post August 26, bringing them within range of the British guns on Bunker Hill. It was an act intended



to invite an attack, which was, however, declined. General Sullivan fortified it under a heavy fire, and pushed out his picket line till it confronted the enemy's within ear-shot; and the place became the scene of much sharpshooting, chiefly conducted by Morgan's Virginia riflemen, who



had reached the camp during the summer. There were redoubts also at Ten Hills Farm, which Sullivan had erected to protect his post at Ploughed Hill from assault on the Mystic side; and some traces of them are still left.



The road by Ploughed Hill led on to Winter Hill, which was fortified immediately after the battle of Bunker Hill, and garrisoned chiefly by New Hampshire troops. The main defence was on the summit, where the road to Medford now diverges. Much of the proficiency of Sullivan's camp was due to his brigade-major, Alexander Scammell. (See *Historical Magazine*, September,



1870.) A good deal of the military spirit of the camp was derived from a veteran of the French



wars, John Nixon, who had been very busy on the Lexington day, been wounded at Bunker Hill,



and the army was brigaded, Greene was stationed here under Lee, assuming command on July 26, with a force of three or four thousand men, including his Rhode Islanders, who had been earlier encamped at Jamaica Plain. It was on Prospect Hill that Putnam hoisted his Connecticut flag, — "An appeal to Heaven," — on July 18; and again on Jan. 1, 1776, what



and was made a brigadier in August. Henry Dearborn and John Brooks, both later known in Boston history, were also officers of this camp.

From this Winter Hill fort, one road leading to Medford passed the old Royall mansion, where Lee and Sullivan each at one time made their quarters, and where Stark held his command. The story of the famous old mansion is told in Drake's *Landmarks of Middlesex*, ch. vi. About equally distant on the road to Concord was the old Powder Tower, whose remains are to-day one of the most characteristic relics of the past near Boston. Drake's *Landmarks of Middlesex*, ch. v. It was to this magazine that Gage sent the expedition in September, 1774, to seize the powder, as told in the preceding chapter.

The uneven valley between Winter and Prospect hills was guarded by more than one redoubt; and in the rear of one of them, in an old farm-house still standing on Sycamore Street, known as the Tufts house, Lee had his headquarters.

Pelham's map shows the extensive works and out-works which crowned the summit of Prospect Hill, and extended on the one hand into the valley toward Winter Hill, and on the other toward the Cambridge lines. Putnam had begun work here immediately after the retreat from Charlestown. When Washington arrived they called the Union flag of the Confederated Colonies, — a banner with thirteen stripes.

The road which ran from Charlestown Common to Cambridge Common passed just below Prospect Hill (the present Washington Street in Somerville, and Kirkland Street in Cambridge), and between it and the lesser eminence, called then Cobble or Miller's Hill, — now the site of the Insane Asylum, — where Putnam and Knox on the night of November 22, with the regiments of Bond and Bridge as a supporting force, threw up breastworks which afterward



became one of the strongest points of the American lines, and when mounted with 18 and 24 pounders served effectually to keep the enemy's vessels from moving too near.

Just South of Cobble Hill, the marshy land intersected by Willis's Creek made an island of the region now known as East Cambridge, but

which was then called Phips's farm, or Lechmere's Point, the old farm-house standing near where the modern court house is. Richard Lechmere, who owned it, had acquired it by marrying the daughter of Spencer Phips, the royal Lieut.-Governor, whence the two names. He was now a Tory, and the upland was soon put to good use. Gage had found it convenient to land his detachment here, which marched to Lexington; and how Boston looked from this point may be seen from one of the heliotypes in the preceding chapter. There was already one causeway, connecting by a bridge over Willis's Creek the neighborhood of Prospect Hill, when Washington determined to fortify the point, and then to extend the road now called Cambridge Street over the marsh, so as to bring the new fort into more direct communication with his centre. Having protected these two approaches by small works on the main land, and Manly's capture of an ordnance ship supplying him with a 13-inch mortar, he began to extend a covered way there on the night of November 29, and broke ground for his main work on December 11, which he was obliged to complete under heavy fire from the Boston side. This, and the frozen ground, delayed the completion till the latter part of February, 1776. Knox's cannon from Ticonderoga played here a good part in the bombardment of March 2, when one of the shot struck the tower of the Brattle Street Church, and was to be seen there to our day.

Thus the advanced posts of the besieging army from their extreme left at Ploughed Hill were continued through Cobble Hill and Phips's farm; while, to protect the centre front, in November two small redoubts were thrown up, bordering on the marshes, further on toward the Charles. One of these, which was intended to repel boats, was found in complete preservation by Finch, in 1822. The further waste by time was repaired by the Cambridge city authorities, in 1858, who enclosed the earthwork, and named it Fort Washington. Pelham's map, and so does Marshall's, places the other battery nearer the Charles; but Finch could find no trace of it. It probably occupied the knoll in the marsh to which Magazine Street now conducts. Paige's *History of Cambridge*, p. 422.

The interior line of defence, which was constructed earlier by Gridley, consisted of detached works, extending from a point on the Charles, where now the Riverside Press is, over Butler (or Dana) Hill, in the direction of Prospect Hill, and ending near Union Square in Somerville. They can be traced on Pelham's map, and are described in Drake's *Landmarks of Middlesex*, p. 186. Finch, in 1822, could find little trace of them.

Just in advance of this line, in the house of the Tory Ralph Inman, Putnam had his head-quarters. He left his son, Colonel Putnam, here to guard the ladies during the action on Bunker Hill. Drake reports the house in 1873 as being cut asunder and wheeled off. It stood on Inman Street, where the road from the college to Phips's farm made a sharp turn to join the Charlestown road. It is shown in Pelham's map. The house before the war was a centre of attraction for the royalist officers in Boston; for Inman kept good cheer, and had pretty daughters. One of them married John Linzee, who commanded the "Falcon" on Bunker-Hill day.

Putnam, on reaching Cambridge, had occupied the Borland house, popularly known as the Bishop's Palace, directly opposite Gore Hall, on Harvard Street. It had been built about fifteen years before by the Rev. East Apthorp of Christ Church, Cambridge, a son of Charles Apthorp, a Boston merchant. John Adams says it was "thought to be a splendid palace, and was supposed to be intended for the residence of the first royal bishop." Another Boston merchant, John Borland, occupied it up to the outbreak; and it was he who added the third story, to give more accommodation for his household slaves, — as the tale goes. The true front is toward Mount Auburn Street.

A little further west, and within the college yard, is the present Wadsworth House, the former home of the presidents of the college.

The cut on the next page follows a drawing made by Miss E. S. Quincy during the presidency of her father.

The house in 1776 was fifty years old, having been built in 1726 for the occupancy of President Wadsworth; and it did not have the lateral projections, which were put on in Treasurer Storer's time to enlarge the dining and drawing rooms. It was in this house that quarters were assigned to Washington, by provision of the Congress at Watertown, on his coming to Cam-

bridge; as Mr. Deane has conclusively shown in a paper in the *Mass. Hist. Soc. Proc.*, September, 1872, p. 257. See also *Harvard Book: Cambridge of* 1775; Drake's *Landmarks of Middlesex*, p. 206; Quincy's *History of Harvard University*. Miss Quincy thinks that a British shell, which passed over the house and fell in Harvard Square, probably showed that a remoter headquarters were safer for the General. See Dr. Holbrook's account in *Memoirs of Mrs. E. S. M. Quincy*, p. 223.

Hist. Soc. Proc. for 1881. The old Stoughton was to disappear, however, before the war ended. Hollis Hall was also then standing; but hardly a dozen years old. Holden Chapel was thirty years old, and became the place for courts-martial to be held. In May, 1775, the Provincial Congress had taken possession of these buildings, and on the day before Bunker Hill the College library had been removed to a place of safety. The original records of this Provincial Congress are in *Mass. Archives*, cxl.; they have been



THE WADSWORTH HOUSE.

It was in the old meeting-house shown in the engraving, which stood where now the Law School stands, that the Provincial Congress of 1774 held its sessions. Washington attended Sunday services here, occupying a wall pew on the left of the pulpit.

The principal college buildings at this time were Harvard Hall, which, after the fire of 1764, had been rebuilt; Massachusetts Hall; and the Stoughton of that day (seen in the portrait of Wm. Stoughton in Vol. II. 166), which, with the highway opposite, formed a quadrangle of the space now lying between Harvard and Massachusetts, as shown in the old "Prospect of the Colledges in Cambridge in New England," of which there are two conditions of the plate: one in Lieut.-Gov. William Dummer's time, as issued by W. Burgis, and the other in the days of Lieut.-Gov. Spencer Phipps, when William Price issued it. A heliotype, considerably reduced, is given in *Mass.*

printed. In the winter of 1775–76, nearly two thousand men were sheltered in these and the lesser college buildings, and they made use of all the college property. On May 3, 1777, the college steward, Jonathan Hastings, made a return of "the utensils left in the college kitchen, which [words carefully erased, evidently "the colony"] of the Massachusetts Bay have not replaced." (*Mass. Archives*, cxlii. 57.)

It is probable that the earliest works raised after Lexington day were some breastworks



thrown up across what is now the college yard, and it is probable also that they were raised early in May by Colonel Doolittle and his men; and Drake says, *Landmarks of Middlesex*, p. 243, that they extended to the right as far as Holyoke

Place. North of the college buildings and fronting on the Common was the house still standing, now owned by the University and occupied by Professor James B. Thayer, by whose permission the view of the old hall, given in the annexed cut, was taken. The door to the right opens into the room in which General Ward held his council of war, when it was resolved to occupy the heights in Charlestown. In the exterior view, the lower windows to the right of the entrance belong to this room. Dr. Holmes says in his "Gambrel-roofed House and its Outlook:" "I retain my doubts about those *dents* on the floor of the right-hand room, the 'study' of the successive occupants, said to have been made by the butts of the Continental militia's firelocks; but this was the cause the story told me in childhood laid them to. That military consultations were held in that room when the house was General Ward's headquarters; that the Provincial generals and colonels, and other men of war, there planned the movement which ended in the fortifying of Bunker Hill; that Warren slept in the house the night before the battle; that President Langdon went forth from the western door and prayed for God's blessing on the men just setting forth on their bloody expedition, — all these things have been told and perhaps none of them need be doubted." (*Poet at the Breakfast Table*. Also see *Harvard Book*, ii. 424; Stillman's *Poetic Localities of Cambridge;* Drake's *Landmarks of Middlesex*, p. 255; and *Middlesex County*, i. 337; McKenzie's *History of First Church in Cambridge*.) It is well known that the house was the birthplace of Dr. Holmes. At the outbreak of the war it was occupied by Jonathan Hastings, the college steward who, in July, 1775, became the postmaster of Cambridge; and it was



THE HOLMES HOUSE.

his son Jonathan who was later postmaster of Boston. Very soon after Lexington the Committee of Safety took possession, and the original minutes of their doings here are now preserved in the *Mass. Archives*, cxl. It was to this committee that Benedict Arnold, with his Connecticut company, reported, April 29; and from them, May 3, relating to his subsequent resignation, are in the *Mass. Hist. Soc. Proc.*, July, 1871. Colonel Carrington, in his *Battles of the American Revolution*, speaks of Ward, then less than fifty, "as advanced in years and feeble in body." Drake gives the same false impression in speaking of "his age and infirmity" two years later.

M.r Comisary Supply ten men with
y.e Common allowance of rum.
June 13. 1775 Artemas Ward

he received his colonel's commission; and here Ward, upon receiving his commission from the Province to be the ranking general of the Massachusetts forces, fixed his headquarters.

This commission was dated May 19, 1775; and that from the Continental Congress, making Ward the second major-general in the service, bears date June 22. These, with other papers

Almost directly west from this house, and on the other side of the Common, still stands the old elm under which Washington, July 3, 1775, first took command of the unorganized army of soldiers then laying siege to Boston. (*Cambridge in the Centennial*, 1875.) The arrival of Washington was anxiously waited, and his assuming command was expected to "be attended with a

great deal of grandeur. There are," writes Lieutenant Hodgkins, that morning, "one and twenty drummers and as many fifers a beating and playing round the parade." — *Ipswich Antiquarian Papers*, 1881.

The annexed cut follows a painting which represents this historic tree before it had begun to show many signs of age. The house in the background occupied the site of the present Shepard Memorial Church, and was standing during the Revolution. It was known as the Moore House, the home of a certain Deacon Moore, whose wraith was said to haunt it. When it was destroyed some years since, two skeletons were found beneath it, walled up in a cavity.

THE WASHINGTON ELM.

(Drake's *Landmarks of Middlesex*, p. 268.) There are accounts of the tree in *Harvard Book*, ii. and in the paper on "American Historical Trees" in *Harper's Monthly*, May, 1862. Christ Church stood then as now, and, except being lengthened, is not greatly changed in outward appearance. A subscription, mainly effected in Boston, had built it about fifteen years earlier, and its parishioners were now mostly Tories and absentees. It was accordingly converted into barracks, and some of the Southern riflemen found quarters there, though occasional church services were held in it, a member of Washington's staff conducting them. See Dr. Hoppin's *Historical Discourse*.

Proceeding into Brattle Street from Harvard Square, the first house beyond the University Press is all there is left of the old Brattle Estate. The beautiful and extensive gardens with mall and grotto, and stretching to the river, have all disappeared. William Brattle, who occupied it at this time, deserted it, and fled to his friends in Boston. He was the universal genius of his time, and of course was called superficial. A graduate of Harvard, he served by turns as a theologian and preacher, a physician and bloodletter, a lawyer and attorney-general, a politician and counsellor; and then, to make a Tory of him, the place of brigadier in the militia was conveniently found empty. When he went off to Halifax with Gage, they called him "commissary and cook." The place had been vastly improved under the superintendence of a son, Major Thomas Brattle, who had gone to England early in the war, signifying his neutrality, but exerting himself the mean while to alleviate the trials of American prisoners in that country. At the end of the war his return was allowed by the Legislature only on the strong presentation by Judge Sullivan of his claims to consideration. (Amory's *James Sullivan*, i. 139.) The mansion was early appropriated to the uses of Colonel Mifflin,[1] who acted as the quartermaster-general

[1] John Adams describes dining at this house Jan. 24, 1776, with General Washington and his lady and other company, among whom were "six or seven sachems and warriors of the French Caghnawaga Indians with several of their wives and children," then visiting the camp. "I was introduced to them by the General," says Adams, "as one

of the army, and whose memoranda can be seen on the corner of the plan of the British lines on Boston Neck, in a heliotype given in this chapter.

The grounds of the Brattles extended to those of the Vassalls, whose old mansion is still standing, much shorn of its ancient splendor, and lately the residence of Mr. Samuel Batchelder. The house was at this time a passably old one, seventy-five years or even more having passed since its erection, and its history can be read as written by Mrs. James, Mr. Batchelder's daughter, in *The Cambridge of* 1775, p. 93, showing how many changes have been made in its appearance. The Vassalls had owned it since 1736, when Colonel John Vassall was in possession. He had married a daughter of Lieut.-Governor Spencer Phips, and in years to come she and others who bore the name of the bluff, illiterate sailor, William Phips, were foremost figures in the old Tory aristocracy of Cambridge; for her three sisters married Judge Richard Lechmere, Judge Joseph Lee, and Andrew Boardman. In 1741 Henry Vassall, the colonel's brother, bought it. He was then living in Boston, but had lately been a planter in Jamaica, though of a Boston family. (See Vol. II. p. 544.) This Henry married a daughter of Isaac Royall, whose fine mansion on the Medford road we have seen in the occupancy of Lee and Sullivan. The husband died in 1769, and was buried under Christ Church; but the widow survived here till the war began, when she suddenly emigrated to Antigua, leaving the old house to be occupied by the medical staff of the army, under the director-general, Dr. Benjamin Church, who took this position after Washington's arrival. The story of Church's defection need not be told here. Its growth has been traced in Frothingham's *Life of Joseph Warren*, p. 225. (Also see *Siege of Boston*, p. 258; Gordon's *American Revolution*, ii. 134; Loring's *Hundred Boston Orators*, p. 39; Sabine's *American Loyalists;* and Mr. Goddard's chapter in the present volume.) The letter which he addressed to his brother in Boston, and which was intercepted, was written in cipher; and in the *Massachusetts Archives*, cxxxviii. 326, is a copy of it as "deciphered by the Rev. Mr. West, and acknowledged by the doctor to be truly deciphered." It is attested by Joseph Reed, secretary. The translation was printed in the *New England Chronicle and Essex Gazette* of Jan. 4, 1776, at that time printed in one of the college buildings; and is reprinted in *N. E. Hist. and Geneal. Reg.*, April, 1857, p. 123. Church was brought before a council of officers September 13, when he did not attempt to vindicate himself. He was now confined in a front chamber of this house, and the name, "B. Church, Jr.," cut by himself in the panel of a closet door in that chamber, can be traced to-day. The court remanded him to the Provincial Congress at Watertown, whither he was taken in a chaise with a guard under General Gates, and the trial took place in the meeting-house, Church making a plausible speech. It is well known that the result was confinement, which was changed for exile; but the vessel which bore him toward the West Indies was never heard of. The annexed autograph is from a letter which he addressed from this house to the president of the Congress. An early copy of his statement, "From


Y.r Honours afflicted but faithful Humble Servant
Benja Church Junr
Hon.ble James Warren Esq.r
I will assist to the utmost of my ability
in dressing the wounded. — I see their
Distress, feel for them, & will relieve
them in every way in my power.
B Church

of the grand council-fire at Philadelphia, which made them prick up their ears." — *Familiar Letters*, p. 131. John Adams's *Works*, ii. 431.

my prison in Cambridge, Nov. 1, 1775," is preserved in the *Sparks MSS.* xlix. i. 1.



There is no doubt that the wounded from Bunker Hill were brought here, and were placed under the special care of Dr. Eustis and the other surgeons. There is an engraving of Eustis, after Stuart's likeness, in Drake's *Cincinnati Society*. Eustis had been a pupil of Joseph Warren, who procured for him the appointment of surgeon to the artillery regiment at Cambridge, and later he became the senior surgeon of the camp hospital (*Life of John Warren*, pp. 24, 50.) It appears from a paper in the *Massachusetts Archives*, cxxxviii., that Dr. John Warren, the brother of General Joseph Warren, was put in charge of the Cambridge Hospital, June 26, 1775. William Gamage, Jr., was also in attendance on the wounded, both after Lexington and Bunker Hill, from April 19 to Aug. 17, 1775.

Beyond the Vassall house, and on the opposite side of the street, is another, known as the Craigie House, and perhaps the most famous dwelling in America, — at that time the military home of Washington, now the home of Longfellow.

THE CRAIGIE HOUSE.

The annexed cut follows a water-color made by Fenn some years since. When Washington occupied it as his headquarters, his office was the room on the right of the front door, now Longfellow's study. The chamber over it was his bedroom. The present library-room is behind the study, and was used as a staff-room by the commander-in-chief, and is doubtless the apartment in which his secretary, Joseph Reed, made the fair draughts of many of the letters dated at these headquarters. Miss E.



S. Quincy writes to me: "The late Daniel Greenleaf, of Quincy, told me that his father was employed (I believe) to furnish the Vassall House; and calling on Washington, his son accompany-



ing him, the two were invited to dine, — the meal was taken in the room to the right of the front door, and consisted of four dishes of meat, etc., which the aids carved."

We have a pleasant picture of life at the old house in Horace E. Scudder's "Guests at Headquarters" in *The Cambridge of* 1775. The house has been often depicted, — by photography in Stillman's *Poetic Localities*, and in the *Harvard Book*, i.; and on steel in Drake's *Middlesex*, p. 338; etc. The estate at that time was much more extensive than it is at present, and extended northward to include the present Observatory Hill, which at one time bore a summer-house; and from a spring in its neighborhood water was conducted to the mansion through an aqueduct, whose inlet in the foundations of the house is still visible. It is thought that the house was erected by Colonel John Vassall in 1759, and when Washington occupied it was comparatively a new structure. The colonel had but lately abandoned it and joined his Tory associates in Boston, where he occupied the Faneuil house (depicted in Vol. II. p. 523) till he went to England, where he died in 1797. His estate in Cambridge was early confiscated. Immediately upon Vassall's leaving, a Marblehead regiment under Colonel (later General) Glover, took possession. — a band of fisher-



men commanded by a fisherman, who had reported to General Ward, June 22, — and they appear to have occupied the house till July 7, when they received orders to encamp, the Provincial Congress having directed the furnishing of the mansion for Washington's occupancy. The commander-in-chief records an expense for cleansing the quarters, July 15, so that not far from that time he probably first took possession, and remained in it eight months.

Mrs. Washington did not join her husband in this house till December 11. Mrs. Goodwin, the mother of the late Ozias Goodwin, was the housekeeper of the establishment. In the stable, still standing, were the light phaeton and pair with which General Washington had come to Cambridge, beside the saddle-horses of himself and staff.

Later, the house became successively the property of Nathaniel Tracy of Newburyport, who had fitted out the first privateer in the war; of Thomas Russell, the Boston merchant; and, in 1791, of Dr. Andrew Craigie, late apothecary-general of the Revolutionary army, who had served the wounded at Bunker Hill. The annexed autograph is from a paper dated May

14, 1775, at the hospital in Cambridge. From him the house acquired its name, as did the bridge now connecting Boston and East Cambridge, Craigie being prominent in that enterprise. Later it was the home of Sparks (while editing *Washington's Writings*), Everett, and Worcester the lexicographer; and became that of Longfellow in 1837. Drake's *Landmarks of Middlesex*, ch. xiii.

We must pass hastily by two or three other old Tory houses which marked Brattle Street in the Revolutionary days, and which still stand. First, on the corner of Sparks Street, though now elevated on a new basement story, is the house (owned by John Brewster, a Boston banker) which Richard Lechmere (and, later, Jonathan Sewall) occupied, till he was mobbed and fled to Boston in September, 1774. See Mr. Goddard's chapter in this volume, and Mr. Morse's in Vol. IV., for some account of Sewall. Further on, the residence of Mr George Nichols was the house of Judge Joseph Lee, a Loyalist of careful utterance, who, after wintering in Boston with the British during the siege, was permitted to return to his home, and died here in 1802. And still beyond, hidden by large trees, is the old mansion of the Tory George Ruggles, who lived here up to 1774, when the house passed into the hands of Thomas Fayerwether, who gave it the name by which it is best known. It is at present the residence of Henry Van Brunt, the well known Boston architect.

Further on, the road to Watertown made a turn to the left and passed in front of another old mansion, now known as "Elmwood," and the home of James Russell Lowell. The room on the left of the front door is the reception

room, and behind it is his library, though his study is in the third story. At the outbreak of the Revolution, the last of the lieut.-governors, Thomas Oliver, lived here; and it was in this house, "being surrounded by four thousand people," that in September, 1774, "in compliance with their commands," he signed his resignation and fled to the protection of the soldiers in Boston. When Benedict Arnold, with his Connecticut Company, arrived in Cambridge just after the Lexington fight, they were quartered in this house, but the company remained only three weeks in camp, having been selected in the mean while, as the best equipped company in the army, to deliver within the British lines the body of a royal officer who died of wounds received on April 19. After Bunker Hill the house became a hospital, and the dead were buried in the opposite field. There are other views of this house in Drake's *Landmarks of Middlesex*, p. 317; Stillman's *Poetic Localities of Cambridge*; and, with a notice by John Holmes, in the *Harvard Register*, June, 1881. The city of Cambridge has recently put up tablets to mark its interesting historical sites. *Harvard Register*, February, 1881.

South of the Charles, with the defences on the Brookline shore, began the extreme left of the lines of the right wing. The fort at Sewall's farm was partly on the estate of Mr. Amos A. Lawrence, where traces of it remained till a few years ago, and partly across the track of the Boston and Albany Railroad. It was built by Colonel Prescott's regiment, assisted by Rhode Island troops, just after the battle of Bunker Hill. Prescott had his headquarters in a house half a mile west on Beacon Street, now distinguished by the large elms about it. *Mass. Hist. Soc. Proc.*, October, 1869, p. 151; Woods's *Brookline*, p. 69.



ELMWOOD.

The centre of this wing at Roxbury guarded the only land entrance to Boston. The first defence which the Americans threw up was a redoubt across the main street, where Eustis Street now branches from Washington Street; and it became known later, when it was strengthened, as the Burying-ground Redoubt. When, on August 23, they began an advanced line, they first fortified Lamb's Dam, which was a dike built for keeping out the tide, and extending from near the lead-works, south of Northampton Street, toward the Neck road; and here, on the

Lewells Point March 23d 1776—
Wm Prescott Colo.

upland, they built a breastwork, and extended entrenchments to the water on the westerly side, completing them September 10.

A redoubt on the corner of Mall Street in Roxbury defended the road to Dorchester, which was pretty much the present Dudley Street.

A regular work was on the estate of Mr. N. J. Bradlee, called the Lower Fort, of which a plan is given in Drake's *Town of Roxbury*, p. 372. It was planned by Knox.

The strong fort which General Thomas erected on the higher land, where now the Co-



THE OLD PARSONAGE IN ROXBURY.

A few days after the fight at Bunker Hill, the old house of Governor Dudley (where now the Universalist Church stands) was taken down, and its foundation stones formed part of the defence here built. Smelt Brook crossed the street in front of it.

There was a battery on rising ground above the marsh, where Sumner Place enters Cabot Street.

Where Parker Street conducts to the site of the old landing place, a battery was held by Colonel Joseph Read's regiment to defend the landing.

A square redoubt on the Ebenezer Francis estate, near Appleton Place, commanding Muddy River, was the most northerly of the Roxbury forts.

chituate stand-pipe is, was known as the Upper Fort. It was begun between July 11 and 14. Drake, *Life of Knox*, p. 18, says that the Roxbury fort was built by that officer, then attracting Washington's attention. This earth-work, perhaps the best preserved of all the Revolutionary defences, was unfortunately, and it would seem needlessly, levelled, in 1869, when the water-tower was built. A small memorial structure near by now points out the



spot, and is inscribed: "On this eminence stood Roxbury High Fort, a strong earthwork planned by Henry Knox and Josiah Waters, and erected by the American army, June, 1775, crowning the famous Roxbury lines of investment at the siege of Boston." It has been said that the first shot fired from its cannon was on July 1. See Lossing's *Field-Book of the Revolution*, ii. 24.

The meeting-house of the First Parish, shown in the cut in Mr. Drake's chapter in this volume, was a conspicuous mark for the royal cannon, and its steeple was the signal-station of this wing of the besieging army. Drake's *Town of Roxbury*, p. 287.

Close by was the house, now the residence of Mr. Charles K. Dillaway, which is also shown in the view given in Mr. Drake's chapter on Roxbury in the present volume. At the outbreak of the war it was occupied by the Rev. Amos Adams of the First Church. It afterward became the headquarters of General John Heath's regiment. He commanded some of the raids in the harbor. He served through the war, and returned at the end of it to die very soon after, Dec. 16, 1783. He is buried in the Roxbury burying-ground, but his grave is without a stone. Drake's *Town of Roxbury*, p. 156.



General Ward, while commanding the right wing after Washington had reorganized the army, had his headquarters in the Datchet or Brinley house, which stood near the present church of the Redemptorists, and of which there are views in Lossing's *Field-Book of the War of 1812*, p. 250, and in Drake's *Town of Roxbury*, p. 327, but which hardly represent the magnificence said to have belonged to it in its palmy days, and which is rather extravagantly set forth in Mrs. Lesdernier's *Fannie St. John*. The Dearborns, both generals, father and son, later occupied this house. A journal of Captain Henry Dearborn, kept during Arnold's Kennebec expedition, is preserved in the Public Library. The Connecticut regiments of Spencer, Huntington, and Parsons were encamped on Parker Hill.



[1]

Thomas, of Kingston, who, having led hither a regiment from Plymouth at the first summons, was made a provincial brigadier, Feb. 9, 1775, a rank confirmed June 22, by Congress, which also made him a major-general, March 6, 1776. Thomas was a physician by occupation, and was born in 1725, of the old Marshfield stock, and had served in the French war. He did not survive long enough to gain much distinction, dying on the Sorel River, in Canada, in the following June, having taken command of the army which had been repulsed before Quebec. His portrait has been engraved in the illustrated edition of Irving's *Washington*. There was a short account of *The Life and Services of Major-General John Thomas*, by Charles Coffin, published at New York in 1844. Of Thomas's camp James Warren wrote to Samuel Adams, June 21, 1775: "It is always in good order, and things are conducted with dignity and spirit, in the military style."

General Greaton was a Roxbury man; had been an active Son of Liberty; was at Lexington; and July 1, 1775, was commissioned colonel of

[1] The order to which this signature is attached is indicative of the resorts to which the forces were put to make up for the want of bayonets, the absence of which had been of such signal disaster to them, a month earlier, at Bunker Hill. It is addressed to Ezekiel Cheever, at Cambridge, and calls for two hundred and fifteen spears for the use of the camp. See *Life of Nathanael Greene*, i. 115.

General Greene, when with the right wing, had his headquarters in the Loring-Greenough house,

(near the Soldiers' Monument), of which a view is given in Vol. II. p. 345.

The headquarters of Colonel Learned's regiment were in the Auchmuty house, of which a



view is given in Vol. II. p. 343 The mansion of Governor Bernard on Jamaica Pond, later occupied by the younger Sir William Pepperell, was the quarters of the Rhode Island Colonel Miller for a while, and later it was used as a camp hospital. The Hallowell house, which is shown in Vol. II. p. 344, was also used as a hospital. The Peacock, a famous tavern, stood on the westerly corner of Centre and Allandale streets, in West Roxbury, and was the resort of British officers from town before the siege. More than once it was the resting place of Washington during the siege; and finally it became the residence of Sam Adams during his term as Governor. Drake's *Town of Roxbury*, p. 435.

The extreme right was protected by the line of breastworks which guarded the entrance to Dorchester Neck. These are shown on Trumbull's and Pelham's maps.

The extension of the American lines within Dorchester Neck had been long contemplated when, on February 26, Washington wrote: "I am preparing to take a post on Dorchester Heights, to try if the enemy will be so kind as to come out to us." On Saturday evening, March 2, 1776, Washington notified General Ward of his determination to occupy Dorchester Heights on Monday. At eight o'clock on the night of March 4, the intrenchments were begun there. On that night the Americans fired one hundred and forty-four shot and thirteen shells into Boston from their various defences, — chiefly from Lamb's Dam. The rapidity with which the defence was formed on the Heights was owing to the employment of fascines, which had been prepared during the winter in Milton and vicinity. They were first carted to Brookline, to deceive the enemy in regard to the point where they were to be used; and from this deposit a train of wagons, under the charge of Mr. James Boies, conveyed them after dark to the hill. See the statement of Mr. Jeremiah Smith Boies, — who died in 1851, aged eighty-nine, and who was with his father, riding behind his saddle, that night, — printed in the *Boston Daily Advertiser*, March 17, 1876.

One of the devices for defence had been a row of casks in front of the works, and these, filled with earth and stones, were to be rolled down the declivity as the enemy approached. General Heath records that this device was suggested by a Boston merchant, Mr. William Davis; and Stedman admits that it was a curious provision, which would have swept off whole columns at once. "It was therefore," he adds as if a consequence, "determined to evacuate the town." A monument on Dorchester Heights bears this legend: "Location of the American redoubt on Dorchester Heights which compelled the evacuation of Boston by the British army, March 17, 1776."

Beside the maps already referred to as useful in tracing the positions of the different works on this extensive line of circumvallation, the earliest account which we have of them, after they had begun to disappear, is that of J. Finch, published in *Silliman's Journal* in 1822, and reprinted in Frothingham's *Siege of Boston*, p. 409. Various later writers have attempted to trace them in detail. Chief among such are Lossing, in his *Field-Book of the Revolution;* S. A. Drake, in his *Landmarks of Middlesex:* and F. S. Drake, in his *Town of Roxbury*. Some aid will be derived from Woods's *Brookline*, and the histories of Dorchester and South Boston.

THE LITERATURE OF THE SIEGE. — This has been enumerated in Winsor's *Readers' Handbook of the American Revolution*. The most extensive accounts, apart from the general histories, are Richard Frothingham's *Siege of Boston*, and Dr. Ellis's, in the *Evacuation Memorial*. Of contemporary material, the most important sources are Sparks's *Washington's Writings; Life of Joseph Reed; Life of General Greene;* Gordon's *American Revolution;* Colonel John Trumbull's *Autobiography;* Thacher's *Military Journal;* Heath's *Memoirs;* with additional matter in *Mass. Hist. Soc. Proc.*, May, 1859; and papers in Almon's *Remembrancer*, and Force's *American Archives*. There are letters in the *Life of Dr. John Warren;* in the *Life of George Read;* in Abigail Adams's *Letters;* etc. Various camp diaries are in existence: David How's, New York, 1865; McCurtin's, published by the Seventy-six Society; Dr. Belknap's, in *Mass. Hist. Soc. Proc.*, June, 1858; Ezekiel Price's, in Ibid., Nov., 1863; Paul Lunt's in Ibid., Feb., 1872; Samuel Bixby, in Ibid., March, 1876; Samuel Sweat's letters, Ibid., December, 1879; diary in *Hist. Mag.*, October, 1864; Aaron Wright's diary in *Boston Transcript*, April 11, 1862; Craft's journal in *Essex Institute Collections*, vol. iii.; letters in *N. E. Hist. and Geneal. Reg.*, April,

1857, etc. Also, a number of orderly-books, — William Henshaw's, April 20 to Sept. 26, 1775, in *Mass. Hist. Soc. Proc.*, October, 1876, and printed separately, 1881, with additional matter (there are later ones of Henshaw in the Amer. Antiq. Soc.); Israel Hutchinson's, in Ibid., October, 1878; Glover's, in *Essex Institute Collections*, v: and among those not printed, — that of John Fenno, secretary to the commander-in-chief, April 20 to Sept. 6, 1775, in Massachusetts Historical Library; one kept at Cambridge, in the Pennsylvania Hist. Soc. Library; Jeremiah Fogg's, in Harvard College Library; and William Lee's, in the Historical Society's Library. An order-book of the Continental army, June 21, 1775–Oct. 9, 1775, the property then of Asahel Clark, of Woodstock, Conn, is noticed in *Daily Advertiser*, Nov. 11, 1880.

The *Massachusetts Archives* are rich in illustrative documents, and Force's *American Archives* give many of the orders. References to sources of information regarding the daily life within the British lines are made in a note to Mr. Scudder's chapter in this volume.

Three well-known novels in some degree depict the events in and about Boston during these Revolutionary days: Cooper's *Lionel Lincoln*, Mrs. Child's *Rebels*, and Hawthorne's *Septimius Felton*.

Material for determining the rank and file of this Patriot army is at the State House, in what are called the *Massachusetts Revolutionary Rolls*. A return of the main guard at Cambridge, 1775, is in vol. xxxvi. p. 267. Rolls of the army at Cambridge, in 1775, are contained in vol. xiv. Lists of the field, staff, and company officers of the Massachusetts regiments in 1775 (sixty-six colonels, sixty-one lieut.-colonels, one hundred and thirty-two majors), are in vol. xxvii. p. 197, etc. Other lists of the field and company officers of Massachusetts regiments, 1775–76, and of officers of sea-coast companies, are in vol. xxviii. Full lists of the colonels of Massachusetts regiments, from 1767 to 1775, are in vol. xxviii. p. 84. Pay-rolls of companies for sea-coast defence, 1775–80, are in vols. xxxvi. and xxxvii. Company rolls of various dates, 1776–81, are in the vols xvii. to xxiv. As a rule, the rolls at the State House, before 1774, are included in the series called *Massachusetts Archives*; but from 1775 to the end of the war they are arranged in what is called the *Massachusetts Revolutionary Rolls*. Various rosters of the regimental officers are printed in 4 Force's *American Archives*, ii., iii.; and in *Colonel William Henshaw's Orderly-Book*.

THE NAVAL SERVICE. — The *Massachusetts Archives*, vols. clxiv. to clxxii., contain documents relating to privateers commissioned from 1775 to 1783. They have been indexed by Dr. Strong, first chronologically and then alphabetically, by the names of the vessels. The earliest Boston vessel named was the "Lady Washington," of thirty tons, April 22, 1776. Then come for the same year the following: "Yankee," "Adam," "Hannah and Molly," "Warren," "Independence," "Boston," "Langdon," "Wolfe," "Speedwell," "Viper," "Phœnix," "Washington," "Eagle," "General Mifflin," "Hawke," "Satisfaction," "Reprisal," "American Tartar," "Hancock."

In 1777: "Buckram," "General Mercer," "Revenge," "American," "Freedom," "Mars," "Fancy," "Cleora," "Charming Sally," "Union," "Betsy," "Sturdy Beggar," "Bunker Hill," "Harlequin," "Friend," "Cumberland," "Starkes," "Lizard," "Active," "Resolution," "Congress," "America," "Washington," "Pallas," "True Blue," "General Arnold," "General Lincoln," "George," "Lydia," "Lively," "America."

After 1777 the number increases, and the index shows three hundred and sixty-five vessels in all, as commissioned and belonging to Boston. In the *Revolutionary Rolls*, vols. v.–vii., are many of the bonds given by the owners of these vessels. There are also numerous bonds in the *Massachusetts Archives*, cxxxix. 93, etc. Clark's *Naval History of the United States* gives the names of three hundred and forty-two English vessels captured by the Continental privateers in 1776. See also *The Remembrancer* and Cooper's *Naval History*. More or less account of the beginnings of the navy, and of naval successes, will be found in Frothingham's *Siege of Boston*, pp. 260, 269, 308, and in the Lives of Manly, Tucker, and the other commanders. An abridgment of Sheppard's *Life of Tucker* is in the *N. E. Hist. and Geneal. Reg.*, April, 1872. Admiral Preble (*N. E. Hist. and Geneal. Reg.*, 1871, p. 363; 1872, p. 21) gives a list of armed vessels built or fitted out in Massachusetts, 1776–83, which is compiled chiefly from Emmons's *Statistical History of the United States Navy*. Lists of Massachusetts war vessels, 1775, are in *Massachusetts Revolutionary Rolls*, xxvii. Volume xxxix. of the *Revolutionary Rolls* contains the rolls of various State vessels, namely, — Brig "Massachusetts," 1776, 1777; brig "Tyrannicide," 1777–1779; brig "Freedom," 1775–1778; ship "Protector," 1779–1782; ship "Tartar," 1781; brig "Hazard," 1777–1780; ship "Ranger" 1777; ship "Mars," 1780, 1781; sloop "Defence," 1781, 1782. Other navy rolls, largely of privateers, are in vol. xl. Officers of armed vessels, 1775, 1776, are in *Massachusetts Revolutionary Rolls*, xxviii 130. *Massachusetts Archives*, vol. clvii., so far as it relates to maritime affairs, consists largely of accounts of supplies and ordnance furnished armed vessels. There is much also in the *Pickering Papers*.

CHAPTER III.

THE PULPIT, PRESS, AND LITERATURE OF THE REVOLUTION.

BY DELANO A. GODDARD,

Editor of the Boston Daily Advertiser.

THE famous discourse of Jonathan Mayhew, in the West Church, in 1750, on the Sunday following the anniversary of Charles the Martyr, has been fitly called the "morning gun of the Revolution."[1] Since the restoration of the monarchy this anniversary had been observed in England as a national fast, when the clergy were required to read the service, or preach a sermon against disobedience to authority. Many intelligent persons were at this time apprehensive lest the prelacy should be introduced into New England; and they suspected that even the missions of the church were a cover under which religious liberty was to be sacrificed. Mr. Mayhew, then in his thirtieth year, and in the full vigor of his ripe and manly powers, took this occasion to preach three discourses against the pretension of unlimited submission and non-resistance to authority; in which, with ingenious audacity, he "unriddled" the mysterious doctrine of the prince's saintship and martyrdom, and set forth with singular boldness and eloquence the principles of free civil government. The last of these discourses,[2] with portions of the two preceding it, were at once printed in England and America, and excited profound emotion in both countries.

There were at this time eighteen churches and religious societies in Boston.[3] The intolerance of opinion and the severity of pulpit manners prevailing during the greater part of the first century had in a measure passed away. Prince, Colman, Mayhew, Chauncy, Sewall, Eliot, and less conspicuous ministers introduced more generous views of faith and life, and at the same time set the example of a style in preaching comparatively simple and pure, formed upon good models, and tempered by good sense and unaffected sincerity. The higher departments of learning were pursued by the clergy with steadily increasing spirit. The classics, philosophy,

[1] J. Wingate Thornton, *The Pulpit of the American Revolution*, p. 43. [The West Church is shown in the frontispiece of this volume. — ED.]

[2] *A Discourse Concerning Unlimited Submission and Non-Resistance to the Higher Powers: with some Reflections on the Resistance made to King Charles I., and on the Anniversary of his Death.* Boston, 1750.

[3] *Mass. Hist. Col.*, iii. 256–266.

dialectics, science, and the best literature were studied next to the Bible, as aids to the presentation of its precepts and doctrines. The "five points of Calvinism," long insisted upon with strenuous energy, were yielding before original and independent study of the sources of all truth. Faithful and devout ministers, while holding fast to the essentials of the Orthodox faith, questioned the extreme interpretations thereof till then prevailing, or rejected them altogether. They were at the same time devoted lovers of civil liberty. The general and artillery Election sermons, — the first given the last Wednesday in May, at the meeting of the General Court, when counsellors were chosen; [1] the second at the annual election of officers of the Ancient and Honorable Artillery, — greatly contributed to the Revolutionary spirit. Copies of the sermons were given to the members of the General Court for distribution; and during the year the country pulpits resounded with the sentiments of these state discourses. The whole church-going people were thus enlightened in speculative and practical politics to a degree unknown anywhere else in the world.[2]

Mr. Mayhew was one of the most outspoken of these preachers, and came to be recognized as a prophet of the new dispensation. He began his career with an eager thirst for learning, united with a deep religious spirit. He formed for himself habits of methodical reading and systematic reflection, thus early laying upon a rock[3] the foundations of his faith. His ministry was a prolonged conflict. The clergy of the town for a time stood aloof from him; and when he was at last admitted to ministerial fellowship, the Episcopal controversy renewed the strife in another form. His first printed discourses on the right of private judgment, and of freedom of inquiry for moral and religious truth, gained for him the degree of Doctor of

[1] [The earliest of these election sermons is that for 1634, and from that time to the present the roll of the preachers' names is complete, except for fifteen years. The latest list of such is that prepared by H. H. Edes, and appended to the Rev. C. E. Grinnell's sermon, printed in 1871. The earliest of the sermons preserved is that of Thomas Shepard, delivered in 1638, and printed, from the original MS., in the *N. E. Hist. and Geneal. Reg.*, October, 1870, p. 361. It is not known that any was ordered to be printed before Richard Mather's, in 1644; and it is not known that this was printed (*Records of Massachusetts Bay*, May 29, 1644); and the same statement can be made regarding Thomas Cobbett's, in 1649. The earliest known to have been printed was John Norton's, in 1661; but this was not issued from the press till 1664. In the mean while John Higginson's had been delivered and printed in 1663. The *Boston Public Library Bulletin*, January, 1881, contains a list of those known to have been printed. During the period covered by this chapter, sermons were delivered every year except 1764, when the small-pox prevailed in Boston. In 1775 there were two, — one by Samuel Langdon, before the Provincial Congress, at Watertown, May 21; the other by William Gordon, before the House of Representatives, July 19. In 1780, Simeon Howard delivered the usual one; and Samuel Cooper another, at the beginning of the State Constitution, October, 25. — Ed.]

[2] [See Gordon, *History of the American Revolution*. — Ed.]

[3] "Having been initiated in youth in the doctrines of civil liberty, as they were taught by such men as Plato, Demosthenes, Cicero, and other renowned persons among the ancients; and such as Sydney and Milton, Locke and Hoadley, among the moderns, — I liked them: they seemed rational. And having learnt from the Holy Scriptures that wise, brave, and virtuous men were always friends to liberty; that God gave the Israelites a king in his anger, because they had not sense and virtue enough to like a free country; and that where the spirit of the Lord is there is liberty, — this made me conclude that freedom was a great blessing." — Dr. Mayhew's *Sermon on the Repeal of the Stamp Act*, 1766.

Divinity from one of the Scotch universities, — always prompt and generous in recognizing eminent talent in the New World. These were followed by the celebrated sermons already mentioned, as well as by other discourses on the nature of government and the principles of civil liberty, through which he became identified with the able men then building, better than they knew, for the independence of the colonies.

In the Episcopal controversy, which greatly stimulated the literary activity of the colony and created the liveliest interest among the learned men of the country, Dr. Mayhew was a conspicuous figure.[1] In this discussion it was maintained, on the part of the advocates of Episcopacy, that the Church of England was the established and legal system here as in Great Britain, and that other forms of Christianity only existed through tolerance or permission. Dr. Mayhew, in behalf of the Congregational churches and the dissenting interest, denied this; and maintained that the charters, especially that of Massachusetts, gave absolute authority to the colonial government in matters of religion, and that there was no power in Church, Crown, or Parliament to control or interfere with it. The dispute thus begun was carried on for many months with deep feeling on both sides, and by distinguished contestants in England and America. Grave political questions, growing out of the efforts of the Crown to enforce oppressive acts of trade, at the same time commanded attention. To these Dr. Mayhew gave the last expiring energies of his noble life. He died in 1766, at the age of forty-six years; being then, in learning, courage, and eloquence, the first preacher in America. His printed discourses during the twenty years of his ministry, nearly seventy in number, display remarkable originality and maturity of thought united with great earnestness and directness of expression, a lively imagination, familiarity with books, and comprehensive knowledge of the affairs of the world. His genius and accomplishments were worthy of any age. The cause of liberty in the eighteenth century had no worthier advocate.[2]

Dr. Mayhew's successor, the Rev. Simeon Howard, was also an Arian in religion and a decided Whig in politics, though not of an aggressive or controversial temper. The memorable event of his ministry was the seizure of the church to be used as a barrack for the British troops during their occupancy of the town. Many of his parishioners went with him to Halifax, where he had warm friends, and where a pulpit was ready to receive him.

[1] This famous controversy was begun by the Rev. East Apthorp, an Episcopal clergyman, representing in Cambridge the "Society for Propagating the Gospel in Foreign Parts." He was a son of Charles Apthorp, merchant of Boston, and was educated at Cambridge, England. He returned to this country upon his admission to holy orders, filled with zeal for his calling; but the time was not favorable, and, after a checkered ministry of six years, he went again to England, where he died in 1816, closing a life of great usefulness and distinction at the age of eighty-four years. He was a sound scholar, and a learned and ingenious writer. Sprague, *Annals of the American Pulpit*, v. 179.

[2] Bradford, *Memoir of the Life and Writings of Dr. Mayhew*; Dr. Charles Lowell, *Historical Discourses*; Dr. Charles Chauncy, *Funeral Sermon*; Dr. Bartol, *West Church and its Ministers*. [See also Dr. McKenzie's chapter, in Vol. II., p. 244, where a portrait is given; and Dr. Peabody's in the present volume. — Ed.]

Returning to Boston the following year, Dr. Howard devoted his energies to restoring his scattered society, and succeeded, through many personal sacrifices. He was not eminent as a preacher, though his style is described as perspicuous and flowing, and his method as exact and luminous. His simplicity of character, his modest and gentle manners, and the unfailing charity of his disposition under trying circumstances won for him the love of his people and the respectful homage of the community. He received the degree of Doctor of Divinity from the University of Edinburgh; was an overseer of Harvard College, and a zealous member of many societies for the promotion of charity, literature, and religion.[1]

The ministry of the Rev. Thomas Foxcroft of the First Church was closed by his death in 1769. Educated in the Episcopal church he early changed his views, and for half a century had been a consistent adherent of the New England faith and order of church government. He was a stanch Calvinist, and in his earlier ministry was a persuasive and popular preacher; but through prolonged illness his powers had lost their freshness and vitality before the crisis came.[2]

Next to Dr. Mayhew in the group of eminent pre-Revolutionary divines, though his senior by fifteen years, was Mr. Foxcroft's distinguished colleague and successor, Dr. Charles Chauncy. When the great debates, theological and political, were coming on, he was just passing middle life, and he gave to them all the powers of his highly gifted nature. During this exciting period the interests of Christianity and of civil government were inseparably bound together. The Rev. John Wise's masterly plea, *Democracy, Christ's Government in Church and State*, written for the time of Andros, was reproduced in form and spirit by the clergymen and Patriots of the time of Hutchinson. From 1750 to 1776 this principle had no more watchful and determined champion than Dr. Chauncy. Side by side with Mayhew he fought the good fight for ecclesiastical freedom; and when that gallant warrior fell, he continued the fight with redoubled spirit. For ten years he pursued the Episcopal controversy with unsparing energy, as well as with great learning and strength of reasoning. The contest began with his Dudleian lecture on the "Validity of Presbyterian Ordination Asserted and Maintained," and closed with "A Complete view of Episcopacy," — a work of deep interest at the time, and regarded as the ablest of his controversial writings.

Dr. Chauncy was equally confident and alert in the advocacy of his political principles.[3] He knew the Colonies were right. He knew they

[1] The Rev. John Pierce, D.D., in Sprague's *Annals of the American Pulpit*, viii. 65–67. [See also Dr. Peabody's chapter in the present volume. — Ed.]

[2] He was critically skilled in the Greek language, a theologian of some excellence, and the author of many sermons in print. Emerson, *Historical Sketch of the First Church*. See also Sprague, *Annals of the American Pulpit*, i. 310, 311.

[3] Mr. Thornton, in the *Pulpit of the American Revolution*, p. 114, prints Dr. Chauncy's Thanksgiving sermon, preached July, 1766, on the occasion of the repeal of the Stamp Act, entitled "A Discourse on the Good News from a far Country," with the comment: "This sermon,

would triumph. If human strength were wanting, angels would fight in their behalf. When his friends, familiar with the extreme literalness of his usual discourse, suggested the imprudence of trusting to active recruitment from that quarter, he persisted in saying that such would be the fact. Indeed his style of writing and preaching was severely, not to say defiantly, plain. He had no comprehension of poetry, and he despised rhetoric. It is said that he prayed he might never be an orator. His enemies replied, with more wit than truth, that his prayer was undoubtedly granted. Expediency had no place in his view of divine or human economy. Duplicity and affectation he ranked with the basest vices. His ministry with the First Church continued sixty years, from the time of his ordination until his death in 1787. His printed works include sixty sermons and controversial tracts, and some volumes of theology.[1]

Of like political principles, but in every other respect a striking contrast to Dr. Chauncy, was the accomplished minister of Brattle Street Church, the Rev. Samuel Cooper. He was an elegant rather than a profound scholar, and a most attractive and popular preacher. He is described as of a fine and commanding presence,[2] with a voice of great sweetness and power, uniting with remarkable fluency, as well as grace and force of expression, appropriateness and energy of thought, which never failed to arrest and hold attention. In his religious opinions he was moderately liberal. From the beginning of his ministry he was deeply interested in public affairs, and every occasion for service found him ready to take his full share in them, with Mayhew and Chauncy among the clergy and with Otis and Samuel Adams among the popular leaders. He resisted the ministerial plan of taxation, through the pulpit as well as through the newspapers, to which he was also a frequent contributor.[3] His zeal won for him great influence, and his counsel was sought by all the leading Patriots

an admirable historical picture, drawn by a master, himself a leader of the hosts, abounds in facts, discusses the great principles involved with energy and power, and with the calmness and precision of the statesman."

[1] Dr. John Eliot writes: "Dr. Chauncy was one of the greatest divines in New England. No one, except President Edwards and the late Dr. Mayhew, had been so much known among the *literati* of Europe, or printed more works on theological subjects." See also W. C. Fowler, *Chauncy Memorials:* Tudor, *Life of James Otis*, p. 147; and Sprague, *Annals of the American Pulpit*. [A portrait of Dr. Chauncy is given in Vol. II. p. 226, with a characterization of him by Dr. McKenzie in the same chapter. See also Dr. Peabody's chapter in the present volume. — Ed.]

[2] [See his likeness in Vol. II. p. 242. The *Boston Magazine*, 1784, p. 191, has a portrait of him engraved by J. Norman. See William Sullivan's account of Cooper in his *Public Men*. — Ed.]

[3] "Of the writings which alternately stimulated and checked the public mind in that season of stormy excitement, there were perhaps none of greater efficiency than those of Dr. Cooper. If other hands launched the lightning, his guided the cloud." — Palfrey, *Sermon preached to the Church in Brattle Square*, July, 1824, pp. 16, 17. Dr. Allen (*Am. Biog. Dict.*) says: "His sermons were unequalled in America for elegance and taste." [The somewhat famous verses on the "Boston Ministers," written in 1774, thus characterize him:—

"There's Cooper, too, a doctor true,
Is sterling in his way;
To Jerry Seed, all are agreed,
He well be likened may.
In politics, he all the tricks
Doth wonderously ken;
In 's country's cause and for her laws,
Above most mortal men."

These verses, by "a lover of jingle," are printed in the *N. E. Hist. and Geneal. Reg.*, April, 1859. — Ed.]

of the time. He was the confidential friend and correspondent of Dr. Franklin and of many men of eminent learning in the colony and in Europe; while his personal attractions and knowledge of the world won the intimate regard and friendship of all cultivated persons, except of the officers and supporters of the Crown, by whom he was cordially hated, and for whom he showed no mercy. He was careless about his permanent reputation, was publicly identified with no great historical incidents, and left little printed material to explain his undoubted influence and popularity. He was always a good friend to literature, and a useful patron to Harvard College, of which he was once elected president; and was one of the founders of the American Academy.[1]

The largest congregation in Boston, during the few years preceding the Revolution, was that of the New North Church, under the ministry of the Rev. Andrew Eliot. He was in his religious views a moderate Calvinist, a direct, forcible, and practical preacher, rarely indulging in controversy. He opposed the establishment of Episcopacy by law, and the introduction of bishops; but it was the principle only, and not the practice, to which his conscience objected. When at the close of the siege the troops and the Loyalist inhabitants thought proper to leave the town, it was through his persuasion that Mr. Parker of Trinity was induced to remain, in order that Episcopalians might not be left wholly without a shepherd. During the siege, when his family and many of his friends had departed, he was himself induced to stay and continue the services of his church.[2] His only companions of the same faith were Samuel Mather and Mather Byles, with whom, it may well be supposed, his relations were not intimate. He continued to preach regularly, but with the circumspection which had always distinguished him, and which his present situation especially required. Even in times of the highest excitement Dr. Eliot had resolutely closed his pulpit against political discussions, to the serious displeasure of many persons who never thought of doubting his fidelity. Though sometimes taunted for his scruples, he was a warm friend of America, and was early and constant in his advocacy of the claims of the Colonies; but he never allowed political feeling to interfere with his literary zeal any more than with what he regarded as his religious duty. When Hutchinson's house was mobbed, many valuable books and manuscripts, including that of the second volume of the *History of Massachusetts Bay*, were rescued from destruction through the efforts of Dr. Eliot. He was frequently urged to accept the presidency of the college, and, upon the death of Dr. Holyoke, was chosen to that office, which he declined. His unusual natural gifts were cultivated in many directions. "He sought and intermeddled with all knowledge." Some of his occasional discourses were printed as they were delivered; but, like Dr. Cooper, he was careless of his own

[1] Tudor, *Life of James Otis*, p. 155; Sprague, *Annals of American Pulpit*, i. 440; Lothrop, *History of the Church in Brattle Square*.

[2] [His letters from Boston during the siege are printed in *Mass. Hist. Soc. Proc.*, 1878, p. 281. — Ed.]

fame, and was only induced after much persuasion to print a single volume of his sermons.[1]

The Rev. Samuel Checkley, Jr., minister of the Second or Old North Church, passed away in 1768, at the close of a pastorate of twenty-one years. He was a zealous preacher, rising at times to a certain sort of eloquence, and is said to have been gifted with uncommon felicity in the devotional exercises of public worship. He printed very little, and appears to have taken no part in public controversies.[2] His successor, the Rev. John Lathrop, preached acceptably until the occupation of Boston by the British, when he left the town, and his church was destroyed. Returning to Boston the following year, his ministry was transferred to the New Brick Church, with which the society of the Old North was a little later united. From a strict Calvinist, Mr. Lathrop came to adopt the views of Mayhew and Chauncy, taking his church with him. He was an ardent Patriot, and mingled in the scenes of the Revolution with great zeal and untiring industry.[3]

The Rev. Ebenezer Pemberton had come to the New Brick Church in 1754,[4] but his ministry was not fortunate. The North End was the centre and hot-bed of the Patriot movement. The residents and church-going people generally were stanch Whigs, with whom Mr. Pemberton had little sympathy. Governor Hutchinson was a member of his congregation, and the minister shared the unpopularity of his august parishioner. When, in 1771, Mr. Pemberton, almost alone among the Boston ministers, attempted to read the Governor's proclamation for the annual Thanksgiving, the Whigs, constituting the greater part of the congregation, indignantly walked out of meeting. From that time the attendance fell away. The minister's health perceptibly failed, and in 1775 the house was closed. Dr. Pemberton — he had been made a Doctor of Divinity by the College of New Jersey in 1770 — retired to Andover during the siege and died in 1779, his connection with the society never having been formally dissolved.[5]

Though the Old South Church was the centre of many of the most exciting events of the Revolution, its ministers took a less conspicuous part in them than those of the neighboring churches. The Rev. Joseph Sewall,[6] "father of the clergy," died in 1769, after a pastorate of fifty-six years. He

[1] Eliot, *Historical Notice of the New North Church*; Sprague, *Annals of the American Pulpit*, i. 417–421. [See Vol. II. p. 243. — Ed.]

[2] The Rev. Henry Ware, Jr., *Historical Discourse*, p. 23. [See Vol. II. p. 240. — Ed.]

[3] "Dr. Lathrop's preaching was rather practical than doctrinal; rather sensible than ornate. His sermons were short, not ordinarily exceeding twenty-five minutes in delivery. There was little of the appearance of labor about them; and the thoughts which he expressed, though judicious and pertinent, were generally obvious to ordinary minds, and partook, like the character of his own mind, more of convictions than originality." The Rev. John Pierce, D.D., in Sprague's *Annals of the American Pulpit*, viii. 68–72. [See also Dr. Peabody's chapter in the present volume. — Ed.]

[4] [See Vol. II. p. 244. — Ed.]

[5] "His piety was of that fervent kind for which his father was remarkable. He had not his superior powers of mind, and in his old age grew unpopular in his delivery, though in former times he drew crowded assemblies by his manner His reading, however, was extensive, and his sermons correct in diction and style. He was a Calvinist according to the principles of our fathers." — *Dr. John Eliot.* See also Dr. Robbins's *History of the Second Church*, pp. 189–193.

[6] [See his portrait in Vol. II. p. 241. — Ed.]

was a minister of the old school, preaching the "faith of the fathers" in its strength and purity. Dr. Eliot speaks of him as more remarkable for piety than for learning; yet he was a good classical scholar and familiar with general literature. He possessed a large estate, which he used with great liberality and public spirit.[1] Dr. Sewall had two colleagues during the later years of his ministry,[2] and his pulpit after his death remained vacant for nearly two years, when John Hunt and John Bacon, young men of talent and promise, were settled together. Hunt was of a sensitive and delicate nature, of affectionate and winning manners, and a persuasive preacher. Bacon was of a disputatious and somewhat overbearing temper, and fell into difficulties with his congregation over the doctrines of atonement and imputation. The ministry of both came to an end in 1775,—that of the former by his early death, the latter by dismissal.[3] Soon after, the congregation was broken up, and the church was converted into a riding-school for the troops then occupying the town.

The New South Church passed, in 1773, to the pastoral care of the Rev. Joseph Howe.[4] The storm was gathering rapidly when Mr. Howe began his ministry. "In the harbor," he wrote to an absent friend, "nothing is seen but armed ships; in the town, but armed men." He was not daunted by them. He performed the duties of his office with zeal and fidelity till the storm broke in 1775, when he returned to Connecticut and died the same year. He was a preacher of remarkable promise, and his death was lamented as a genuine calamity.[5]

Of the Congregational clergy, Dr. Mather Byles stood alone against the Revolution. He tried, with undoubted sincerity, to avoid politics in his pulpit; but his opinions were too notorious, and his sharp tongue was too free, to make his position long an agreeable one either to his people or to himself. He left his congregation in 1776, and in the following year was denounced in town-meeting, and tried by a special court for remaining in Boston during the siege and praying for the king. He was sentenced to be confined on board a guard-ship with his family, and sent to England, but the sentence was not enforced. The last twelve years of his life were spent in retirement; and the favor of the community was never restored to him. In the prime of his life he was blessed with a wonderful flow of spirits, with great skill and command of language, and had some claims to be regarded as a pulpit orator.[6]

The Rev. Samuel Mather continued his ministry, without marked incident, over an independent congregation in North Bennett Street, during the

[1] Wisner, *History of the Old South Church*, p. 33.

[2] [See Vol. II. p. 240. — Ed.]

[3] [Ibid., p. 241. — Ed.]

[4] [Ibid., p. 243. — Ed.]

[5] Allen, *Biographical Dictionary;* Sprague, *Annals of the American Pulpit.*

[6] Sprague, *Annals of the American Pulpit*, pp. 376, 382; Tudor, *Life of James Otis.* [His portrait, and some characterization of him, is given in Vol. II. 227, 228. A small oval engraving of him exists, S. Harris, sc. Pelham's engraving is inscribed: "Mather Byles, A. M. et V. D. M. Ecclesiæ apud Bostonum, Nov. Anglorum, pastor. P. Pelham, ad vivum pinx. et fecit." There is some mention of his Revolutionary tribulations in Mr. Scudder's chapter in the present volume. — Ed.]

siege and until his death in 1785, when his congregation returned to the Second Church, from which he had taken their fathers forty-three years before. He was on the side of the Colonies during the whole struggle, but took no active part in the discussions attending it. He had an inherited taste for collecting and preserving books, part of which were destroyed at the burning of Charlestown, and the rest were widely scattered after his death.[1] He contributed little to the literature of the time, except a youthful life of his father, and a work now rarely seen, designed to show that America was known to the ancients, beside occasional sermons and theological tracts.



The piety and talent of the Rev. Samuel Stillman gave dignity to the Baptist church at this time of its low estate. He was called to the pastorate of the First Baptist Church in 1765, and came to be recognized as one of the most powerful preachers of the Revolution. The unattached crowd thronged his obscure little church at the North End upon the report of his homely and effective eloquence; and distinguished strangers, as well as sailors just home from their voyages, met every Sunday morning in its narrow aisles. His piety is described as of the type of Hervey, Watts, Doddridge, and Payson.[2] Nothing stirred him to deeper feeling or more moving eloquence, — sometimes scathing, sometimes pathetic, — than the prevailing inattention to religion. Yet he and his church were as deeply interested as any in the state of the country, and no more potent voice was raised in its behalf than that of Mr. Stillman. He was an early patron of, and most liberal contributor to, Brown University, and was devoted to literature and all good causes. The Second Baptist Church had regular services under the ministration of the Rev. John Davis and the Rev. Isaac Skillman, neither of whom left any special mark. Mr. Davis, during his brief ministry, won much respect by his ability and zeal. Backus speaks of him as "the pious and learned Mr. Davis," and the contemporary notices of his death eulogized him as a man "of fine parts, an excellent scholar, and a pretty speaker."

> "Refined his language, and his reasoning true,
> He pleasèd only the discerning few."[3]

The Episcopal clergy of Boston, in common with their friends in the other colonies, espoused the cause of the Crown. They derived their ecclesiastical authority from the Church of England, and loyalty to the king was a part of their worship. Whatever their individual inclinations might have been, they felt bound in a double sense to resist a sentiment and policy

[1] [See Vol. I., Introduction, p. xviii. For Dr. McKenzie's mention of him, see Vol. II. p. 229. — Ed.]

[2] The Rev. Dr. Jenks in Sprague's *Annals of the American Pulpit.* [See also Dr. H. M. King's chapter in the present volume, where a portrait of Stillman is given. — Ed.]

[3] Backus, *History of the Baptist Church in New England;* Sprague, *Annals of the American Pulpit.*

which must end in open rebellion; and they resisted at the risk of property, reputation, and life itself. Most of them were sent into exile after fighting a losing battle, and the few who remained were subjected to great losses.

King's Chapel, the first Episcopal church in New England, was at this time in a flourishing state. The Rev. Henry Caner, who had been called to the rectorship in 1747, was highly educated and endowed with many popular qualities. Early in his ministry, and largely through his efforts, the first chapel was built. The university of Oxford conferred upon him the degree of Doctor of Divinity. While British ships were in the harbor and British troops in the town, many of their officers regularly worshipped at the chapel. Dr. Caner's ministrations were in every way acceptable to them. There is no trace of his printed discourses later than 1765; but the traditions of his preaching give him a high rank as a man of learning and fine intellectual endowments. He was a devoted Loyalist, and with the departure of the troops in 1776, when it was evident he could no longer be useful in this field, he went with them to Halifax, and soon after returned to England, where he died at a great age in 1792.[1]

The ministry of the learned and venerable rector of Christ Church, Dr. Timothy Cutler, was nearly ended. The grand figure and commanding presence, described by Dr. Stiles, was bowed by infirmity when the crisis began, and in 1765 he passed away at the age of eighty-two years. He was a sincere and consistent Episcopalian, but took no part in the controversy.[2] His assistant, the Rev. James Greaton, continued the services a year or two, when he was succeeded by the Rev. Mather Byles, Jr. This litigious minister had just "dismissed himself," according to the church record, from the church and congregation in New London over which he had been sometime settled, and became a zealous convert to Episcopacy. He was called to the vacant rectorship of Christ Church, and discharged his duties there without marked distinction until the siege, when he again deserted his flock, and left the colony. He was a fierce Loyalist, and was afterward proscribed and banished.

Trinity Church was, at the time of the Episcopal controversy, under the partial care of the Rev. William Hooper.[3] Sabine classes him among the Loyalists, but there is no evidence of his having taken any active share in the contest, even in its earliest stages. He died in 1767. He is described as a man of native nobility of spirit and vigor of mind, uniting with a fine eloquence great clearness of thought and earnestness of purpose.[4] The Rev. Samuel Parker became assistant rector of Trinity at the death of Dr. Hooper. He came to the post at a crisis, and stood by it through many and great trials. He conducted the services during the siege with remark-

[1] Sprague, *Annals of the American Pulpit*, v. 61, 63; Greenwood, *History of King's Chapel*. [See also Dr. Brooks's chapter on the "Episcopal Church." — Ed.]

[2] [An account of the Rev. Timothy Cutler's ministry is given in the *Historical Magazine*, supplement of 1866, p. 124. — Ed.]

[3] [See Vol. II. p. 229. — Ed.]

[4] The Rev. Dr. Bartol, in Sprague's *Annals of the American Pulpit*, v. 123.

able discretion, meeting as well as he could the conflicting claims of his church and of his country. He read the service without interruption, including the prayers for the king, until the Sunday following the Declaration of Independence, when he was publicly warned of the peril of repeating them. The vestry authorized the omission of the offending portions, and the services continued as before. Mr. Parker became rector soon after the war, and received from his congregation many marks of favor for the prudence, patience, and zeal with which, under distressing circumstances, he had kept the holy fire burning on the altar of Trinity.[1] He became the second bishop of the Eastern Diocese in 1803, but died a few months after his consecration. His assistant,[2] the Rev. William Walter, succeeded to the rectorship until 1776, when he also resigned his charge, accompanied General Howe to Halifax, and went thence to England. He was a zealous supporter of the Church and the Crown, and vindicated his sincerity by the sacrifices he made for them. He returned to Boston in 1791, became rector of Christ Church, and remained in that relation till his death. His discourses are described as rational and judicious, "recommended by an elocution graceful and majestical." He was no knight-errant; but, while adhering to his own convictions with quiet persistency, he exercised a large charity toward all forms of faith and Christian worship.[3]

The Rev. John Moorhead, born near Belfast and educated at one of the Scotch universities, came to Boston with a number of Scotch-Irish families in 1727–28, and established public worship, according to the rites of the Scottish Kirk, under the name of the Church of the Presbyterian Strangers. In 1744 the meeting-house in Long Lane, afterward Federal Street, was built for them,[4] and Mr. Moorhead continued his services here until after the Revolution. He published nothing, and his papers were lost or destroyed at the evacuation; but tradition represents him as a forcible preacher, administering the law and the gospel with zeal and fervency. He and his people were warm friends of liberty. During the same period the Rev. Andrew Croswell conducted the worship of an independent society, with some success, in the church of the French Protestants in School Street. He was a stalwart Calvinist, a deadly foe of Arminianism and "new lights" of every kind, always disputing with the ministers, and usually with those who came nearest to his own way of thinking. He published several occasional sermons, including a narrative of the founding and settling of his own new-gathered church. A little later Robert Sandeman, the Scotchman, after holding meetings at the Green Dragon Tavern and other places, expounding his new doctrines, had a house of worship built for him near the Mill Pond in 1765. He rejected belief in the necessity of spiritual conversion, representing faith as an operation of

[1] Sprague, *Annals of the American Pulpit*, v. 296. His publications were limited to a few occasional discourses.

[2] [See Dr. Brooks's chapter. — Ed.]

[3] Sprague, *Annals of the American Pulpit*, v. 226, 233.

[4] [A view of it is given in Vol. II. p. 513. — Ed.]

the intellect, and speculative belief as quite sufficient to insure final justification. He was the founder of the sect of Sandemanians, which survived from the time of his coming to these shores until 1823, when the last light was extinguished.[1]

The Press, like the Pulpit, reflected all the varying phases of current opinion; but its prevailing force was on the side of the freedom of the Colonies. It had conspicuous faults and great virtues; it was personal and partisan to a degree only tolerable in times of conflict; but it was frank, honest, impulsive, and sincere. Of the ebb and flow of events from 1760 to 1775, and the corresponding revulsions of popular feeling, the newspapers give the only satisfactory record. Slow and meagre, for the most part, in presenting the general news of the world, they teemed with resolves, protests, instructions, appeals, sermons, satires, and arguments of every kind, — some addressed to the reason and conscience, some to the strong passions, and all of them written with remarkable force and energy.

Of the pre-Revolutionary journals,[2] the *News-Letter* and the *Weekly Advertiser* remained on the side of the Crown. Richard Draper, who conducted the *News-Letter*, with its numerous combinations,[3] from 1762 to 1774, was an uncompromising Loyalist. The crown officers and their friends had free access to his paper at all times, and defended their cause often with marked spirit and ability. During the occupation the *News-Letter* had no competitor. The few numbers preserved show that the military authorities of the town found it a most serviceable instrument, and that they and their friends used it without scruple and without decency. Upon the death of Richard Draper in 1774, the *News-Letter* was conducted by his widow, with the assistance already indicated, until the departure of the troops compelled its suspension.

The *Weekly Advertiser*, in its later years, had limited influence and comparatively few readers, but was never wanting in zeal for the Government. During the last two or three years (1773–75) the authorities, seeing that the tide was now setting strongly against them, secured new and able writers for its columns. Thomas, who remembered the paper well, says that in 1774 it was the chief organ of the Government party. It was patronized by the officers of the Crown, and attracted much notice from the Whigs. The *Chronicle*, 1768–70, published by Mein & Fleming, the leading booksellers, was neutral at first, afterward independent; but from the beginning there was in it an undertone of depreciation of the leading Whigs,

[1] Drake, *History of Boston*, pp. 618, 619; Allen, *Biographical Dictionary*.

[2] See the chapter on the "Press and Literature of the Provincial Period," in Vol. II.

[3] The title in 1762 was the *Boston Weekly News-Letter and New England Chronicle*. The year following, the title was changed to the *Massachusetts Gazette and Boston News-Letter*, and was decorated with the king's arms. In 1768–69 the *News-Letter* and the *Post-Boy* and *Advertiser* entered into a quasi partnership, — one half of each paper being official, and called the *Massachusetts Gazette*, "published by authority;" the other half of each bearing its own separate title, and published independently. The *Weekly Advertiser* also took for a time the name and decorations of the *Post-Boy*. Thomas, *History of Printing*, ii. 25, 59.

which soon developed into open hostility. Its literary pretensions, exceeding those of any other journal in the colony, did not save it from becoming the vehicle of gross calumnies. The people resented its attacks upon their leaders as insulting to themselves; and John Mein, the editor, was forced to seek in his own country a refuge from their indignation. He went to Scotland in 1770, and never returned.



Thomas and John Fleet, who succeeded to the estate of their father, the founder of the *Evening Post*, just before the storm arose, tried hard to follow his example and to publish a strictly independent journal. Whigs and Tories fought their wordy battles in its pages with great vigor, and the young publishers for a time kept their balance well. But neither party was long disposed to be tolerant of such neutrality. The issues of life and death were too serious to be trifled with in that way; and the proprietors, after unavailing protests against what they regarded as encroachments upon their rights, discontinued the publication in 1775, the last number mentioning, but not attempting to describe, the "unlucky transactions" of the preceding week, — meaning the battles of Lexington and Concord. One incident of many illustrates the difficulty of maintaining its neutral position among the heady currents of this excited community. The Liberty Song,[1] written by John Dickinson, of Philadelphia, and first printed in the *Pennsylvania Chronicle*, July 4, 1768, afterward in the *Boston Gazette*, was reproduced by request in the *Evening Post* a month later, "for the

[1] This song was much in vogue in North America for several years, and was written under circumstances related in the following letter. The time was immediately after the refusal of the Massachusetts Legislature to rescind the circular-letter addressed by the House of Representatives to the speakers of the several Colonies.

Dickinson to Otis.

PHILADELPHIA, July 4, 1768.

DEAR SIR, — I enclose you a song for American freedom. I have long since renounced poetry; but as indifferent songs are frequently very powerful on certain occasions, I venture to invoke the deserted Muses. I hope that my good intentions will procure pardon, with those I wish to please, for the badness of my numbers. My worthy friend, Dr. Arthur Lee, a gentleman of distinguished family, composed eight lines of it. Cardinal de Retz always enforced his political operations by songs. I wish our attempt may be useful. . . .

Your most affectionate, most obedient, servant,
JOHN DICKINSON.

The song was to the tune "Hearts of Oak," and began as follows: —

"Come, join hand in hand, brave Americans all,
And rouse your bold hearts at fair Liberty's call:
No tyrannous acts shall suppress your just claim,
Or stain with dishonor America's name.
In freedom we 're born and in freedom we 'll live.
Our purses are ready;
Steady, friends, steady, —
Not as slaves, but as freemen, our money we 'll give."

Tudor, *Life of James Otis*, pp. 322, 501.

The travesties were promptly answered by Whig verse-writers, their last song closing, —

"In freedom we 're born, and like sons of the brave
We 'll never surrender,
But swear to defend her,
And scorn to survive if unable to save."

[The song seems to have been first publicly sung in Boston, Aug. 14, 1768, on one of the anniversaries of the Stamp Act disturbance; the *Massachusetts Gazette* of August 18 recording the assembling of a great number of "persons of credit at Liberty Hall, where the much admired American song was melodiously sung;" whereupon "the gentlemen set out in their chariots and chaises for the Greyhound Tavern in Roxbury, where an elegant entertainment was provided. After dinner the new song was again sung, and forty-five toasts drunk. After consecrating a tree to Liberty in Roxbury, they made an agreeable excursion round Jamaica Pond; and it is allowed that this cavalcade surpassed all that has ever been seen in America." This famous Greyhound Tavern stood on the present Washington Street in Roxbury, opposite Vernon Street. It was torn down during the siege. (Drake, *Town of Roxbury*, p. 166.) A letter from Dickinson, in answer to a vote of thanks from Boston, is among the old papers (1768) in the Charity Building. — ED.]

benefit of the whole continent of America." Parodies upon parodies followed in subsequent numbers to the great indignation of one or the other of the parties.

The most noted contributors to these journals were Joseph Green (merchant, poet, and wit, though he took no part in the later political discussions),

JOSEPH GREEN.[1]

Samuel Waterhouse (of the customs service, a notorious libeller), Lieut.-Governor Oliver, Daniel Leonard,[2] and Jonathan Sewall.[3]

Twenty years before the battle of Lexington, the *Boston Gazette and Country Journal* was established in Queen Street by Benjamin Edes and John Gill. It was printed on a half-sheet crown folio, afterward enlarged to

[1] [This cut follows a crayon portrait by Copley, belonging to the heirs of the late Rev. W. T. Snow. Perkins, *Copley's Life and Paintings*, p. 62. A larger likeness, by Blackburn, is owned by Miss Andrews of Boston. See Vol. II. of this History, p. 429. Green was born in 1706, and graduated at Harvard College in 1726. He was a merchant of large fortune, and is said to have had the largest private library in New England. He died in England in 1780. — Ed.]

[2] [See the paper on Leonard, by Ellis Ames, in *Mass. Hist. Soc. Proc.*, June, 1873; and Sargent's *Dealings with the Dead*. — Ed.]

[3] "Did not our grave Judge Sewall sit,
The summit of newspaper wit?
Filled every leaf of every paper
Of Mills and Hicks and Mother Draper?
Drew proclamations, works of toil,
In true sublime of scare-crow style;
With forces, too, 'gainst Sons of Freedom,
All for your good, and none would read 'em?"

— Trumbull, *McFingal*.

a whole sheet, the title decorated with rude cuts of an Indian with bow and arrow, and Britannia freeing a bird bound to the arms of France. A little later Minerva appeared in the place of Britannia, holding a spear surmounted by the cap of liberty, and just giving flight to a caged bird toward the tree of liberty.[1] Edes and Gill were both "men of bold and fearless hearts," and welcomed the co-operation of the wisest and ablest counsellors enlisted in the popular movement. Samuel Adams, Jonathan Mayhew, Thomas Cushing, Samuel Dexter, and others, who had spent their first emotions in writing for the *Independent Advertiser*, transferred their eager talents to the new *Gazette*. James Otis, John Hancock, Samuel Cooper, Josiah Quincy, Jr., John Adams, and Joseph Warren joined them a few years later, and resisted through its pages the successive invasions of the chartered rights of the colonies, with rich and varied learning, with arguments drawn from the early conflicts of English liberty, and with fiery and indignant eloquence inspired by a deep sense of injury and lively contempt for the instruments employed to inflict it.

The publication of the "Novanglus" essays in 1774–75 was the most interesting single event in the annals of this journal. The letters of "Massachusettensis," reviewing the questions at issue, in the interest of the Crown, had been printed in the *Massachusetts Gazette*, one of the names of the *Weekly Advertiser*, addressed "to the inhabitants of the province." The authorship was long a secret. From the skill with which the letters were written, their singular moderation and breadth of view, they were attributed to Jonathan Sewall, then attorney-general, a man of learning and talents. It was more than a generation before the true authorship was assigned to Daniel Leonard, of Taunton.[2] They reviewed the progress of the popular discontent with much ingenuity, with the purpose of showing that the course of the English Government was founded in law and reason; that the Colonies had no substantial grievance; that they were a part of the British Empire, and properly subject to its authority. They also urged that resistance was useless; that the English nation had power to enforce its right, and would exercise it.

John Adams returned from the Congress in Philadelphia while these and other ministerial letters were filling the newspapers in Boston, and were topics of conversation in all circles. He at once devoted himself to the task of answering them in a series of letters to the *Boston Gazette*, with the signature of "Novanglus." They were written with characteristic vehemence of manner, but at the same time with remarkable clearness and method, enforced with abundant illustration, and enlivened with original humor. Mr. Adams showed that the Colonies in resisting taxation by au-

[1] Buckingham, *Reminiscences*, i. 166, 120. Dr. Eliot, in *Mass. Hist. Coll.*, vi. 69, suggests another interpretation. The woman with the spear, he says, "may as well represent America in the character of a female active in doing good, profuse of her favors, and pregnant with blessings for future times."

[2] [See Edmund Quincy's *Life of Josiah Quincy*, p. 380; C. F. Adams's edition of *John Adams's Works*, iv. 70. — Ed.]

thority of Parliament avowed no new doctrine, but were consistent with the course marked out for themselves since the first settlement of the country. He declared with emphasis and fervor that the Colonies were no part of Great Britain, and that the supremacy of Parliament was limited to the dominions represented in it. He scornfully rejected the assumption that America would not maintain her right, or that submission was to be thought of because resistance was perilous. The last of these letters was dated April 17, 1775. Two days later came the fight at Lexington, and the debate was adjourned to the field of battle.

These revolutionary letters, written on the threshold of the war, illustrate on both sides the ascendancy of reason over passion; while they disclose also the impassable breadth and fathomless depth of the gulf which separated the contestants. Mr. Leonard's letters were reprinted in various forms during the two years following. Nothing else of his composition compares with them in brilliancy and force of statement, in variety of illustration, or in the plausible manner with which he anticipated and parried the arguments of his adversary. He was a gentleman of fortune, fond of display, and was the original of Beau Trumps in Mrs. Mercy Warren's *Groups*. Mr. Adams's letters were also reprinted and widely read during and after the war. Together "they form a masterly commentary on the whole history of American taxation and the rise of the Revolution." [1]

Other luminous and fervent writers contributed to the *Gazette* during these interesting years, whose signatures, "Candidus," "Fervidus," and the like, are all that is now left of them. With such co-operation the *Gazette* became a great power in the community. Rarely in our history has a single newspaper, with the ruling powers steadily against it, met a difficult crisis with greater courage, maintained its principles with more splendid ability, or exercised so powerful an influence over the minds of men.

During the occupation of Boston by the British troops the *Gazette* was printed in Watertown, whither Edes had secretly conveyed an old press and types sufficient for the purpose. He returned to town after the evacuation, and with his two sons Benjamin and Peter, — Gill retiring from the partnership, — continued the service with unabated zeal; promptly collecting and publishing intelligence during the war, and, through occasional contributions of especial force and urgency, reviving the drooping hopes or stimulating the flagging courage of the sorely tried Patriots. The great writers, however, who had strengthened the hands of the young printer in the beginning, were drawn into the public service, or had fallen as early martyrs to the cause. In losing them the *Gazette* lost also the power and influence of its earlier days.

Isaiah Thomas began the publication of the *Massachusetts Spy* in July, 1770, in partnership with Zachariah Fowle. It was to be printed three times a week, — once on a half-sheet, twice on a quarter-sheet, — and was designed for mechanics rather than for commercial or professional readers. The

[1] *J. Adams's Life and Works*, by C. F. Adams. Tudor, *Life of James Otis*, p. xvii.

THE Massachusetts Spy

A Weekly, Political, and Commercial PAPER; open to ALL Parties, but influenced by None.

VOL. I.] THURSDAY, March 7, 1771. [NUMB. 1.

TUESDAY, *March* 5

As a solemn and perpetual Memorial

Of the Tyranny of the British Administration of Government in the Years 1768, 1769, and 1770 ...

Of the fatal and destructive Consequences of quartering Armies, in Time of Peace, in populous Cities.

Of the ridiculous Policy, and infamous Absurdity, of supporting *Civil Government* by a *Military Force*

Of the great Duty and Necessity of firmly oppoling Defpotism in its firft Approaches:

Of the deteftable Principles and arbitrary Conduct of thofe *Minifters* in Britain who advifed, and of their *Tools* in America who defired, the Introduction of a Standing Army into this Province in the Year 1768;

Of the irrefragable Proof which thofe Minifters themfelves thereby produced, that the Civil Government, as by them adminiftered, was weak, wicked, and tyrannical;

Of the vile Ingratitude and abominable Wickednefs of every *American*, who abetted and encouraged, either in Thought, Word or Deed, the Eftablifhment of a Standing Army among his Countrymen.

Of the unaccountable Conduct of thofe *Civil Governors*, the immediate Repreferitatives of his Majefty, who, while the *Military* were triumphant by inluiting the whole Legiflative Authority of the State, and while the Blood of the maffacred Inhabitants was flowing in the Streets, permitted or repeatedly difclaiming all Authority of relieving the People, by any the leaft Removal of the Troops:

And of the favage Cruelty of the immediate Perpetrators;

Be it forever Remembered

That this day, the Fifth of March, is the Anniverfary of Preflon's Maffacre, in King-ftreet, Boflon, New-England, 1770; in which Five of his Majefty's Subjects were ſlain, and Six wounded, by the Difcharge of a Number of Muſkets from a Party of Soldiers under the Command of Capt. Thomas Preflon.

GOD Save the PEOPLE!

Salem March 5. 1771.

THURSDAY, March 7.

BOSTON.

On Tuefday laſt the anniverſary of the Boſton Maſſacre, at noon, and after nine in the evening, all the bells in town tolled; and at dark was exhibited in the chamber windows of Mr. Revere, in the Old-North ſquare, a ſet of tranſparent paintings, repreſenting, in the fourth window a monumental obelifk, bearing in front the buſt of young Seider; and on the front of the pedeſtal, the names of the five perſons murdered by the ſoldiery on the fifth of March, and all interred in the ſame grave with him: On the back ground of the painting was finely drawn a figure deſigned for the ghoſt of Seider, in the attitude he ſtood when he received his fatal wounds from the murderous hands of the infamous informer Richardſon, and under it, this couplet,

Seider's pale ghoſt freſh bleeding ſtands,
And vengeance for his death demands

In the middle window was a view of the maſſacre in King ſtreet. In the north window ſat the genius of America, holding the cap of Liberty erect, and trampling underfoot a ſoldier hugging a ſerpent, the emblem of a military tyranny.

An Oration containing a brief account of the maſſacre, of the imputations of treaſon and rebellion with which the tools of power endeavoured to brand the inhabitants, and a diſcant upon the nature of treaſons, with ſome conſiderations on the threats of the Britiſh Miniſtry to take away the Maſſachuſetts charter, was alſo delivered that evening at the Factory-Hall by Dr. Young.

Above a year has now elapſed ſince poor little innocent Seider received a murderous, mortal wound, which ſoon put an end to that life, which ONE only has a right to take away. The ſuppoſed murderer has had a fair trial agreeable to the good laws of the land, and been found GUILTY; but not yet puniſhed, and ſtill

Young Seider's blood from th' opening ground Cries,
Juſtice, Juſtice ... *Hear the ſound!*

Some time ago, two Teagues from adiſtant land, converſing with each other on the *groſs conduct* and lenghtening of the days ... Ah Paith, ſaid one, it is the pleaſanteſt place I ever ſaw in my life, *twelve months* of the year is *winter*, the other *ſix is ſummer*. Ah indeed, ſaid the other, it is much pleaſanter now the *days* are *two months* longer

" *I ſhall make no comment on this, for it needs none* "

A ſhock of an Earthquake was felt in this town, Marblehead, &c. laſt Sunday morning. The ſhaking was but juſt perceptible.

For the MASSACHUSETTS SPY

An ACROSTIC.

A s Negroes and L....rs in judgement agree!
N o wonder that vice with her ſins is ſo free!
D evice and low cunning do commonly ſtand!
R elated in friendſhip and join hand in hand!
E xperience doth teach us that poor black
and white!
W hen blended together, as one, will unite!!

MR. THOMAS,

WITHOUT freedom of thought, ſays Mr. Gurdon, there can be no ſuch thing as wiſdom; and no ſuch thing as public Liberty without freedom of ſpeech. This is the right of every man, which ought to know no bounds but the injury of others. Licentiouſneſs in ſpeech extends to the denial of the being of a God, his juſtice or providence, and our accountableneſs to him for our actions, &c. obligations to maintain the tranquility and promote the felicity of the community to which we join ourſelves as members, to do unto every one, as by converſe of condition we could reaſonably expect them to do unto us. To make light of theſe fundamental principles of the law and religion of nature, is a public injury, tending to deſtroy that reverence for virtue, and abhorrence to vice and immorality, which are indeed the principal ſecurities we have for the good behaviour of mankind. Between the freedom of ſpeech here contended for and the injurious uſurpation, there ſeem to be evident marks of diſcrimination, the former meaning no more than the modeſt and ſerious reaſonings of man with man, upon equal terms; the latter an overbearing dogmatiſm or domineering ridicule, aſſuming great wiſdom in the queſtion, and putting the ideot or villian on the reſpondent. There ſeem indeed but two arbiters in the world to which men appeal in matters of debate, Reaſon and Authority. Reaſon is commonly applied to by parties who would endeavour to ſettle matters among themſelves. Authority is what thoſe whoſe capacities are confeſſedly deficient, or who is refractory that nothing but the fear of a maſter can keep them in order. To which of theſe claſſes a man of ſenſe and ſpirit would willingly join himſelf, I will leave all men to determine. In which ſcale the proud, ignorant, haughty and ſelf-conceited are to be found, is well known. Nothing is more prepoſterous than the zeal many pretend for the ſupport of civil and religious liberty, while at the ſame time they do ſome burn with indignation againſt any one who can take the freedom to call one of their favourite notions into queſtion. The ſpirit of a republic being a ſpirit of equality abhors ſuch ſeditious bigotry. The ſame Charles among whoſe *twelve good rules* was found '*Touch no ſtate matters*,' alſo prohibited *all diſputing about religion*. The real truth is that religion and civil policy are ſo cloſely connected that whoever attempts to ſeperate them infallibly deſtroys both, and the ſtate which would diſcourage decent inquiries into the foundation, nature and tendency of either will make very bad, becauſe very ſtupid and unprincipled ſubjects.

God beſtowed upon man his reaſon in order to form him of the origin, and deſign of his being, of the relation he ſuſtains to his creator, and every ſubordinate ſuperior, equal and inferior, and the duties which naturally flow from and accompany theſe relations. This being the foundation and ſcope of all laws civil and ſacred, the ſyſtems immediately deduced from theſe conſiderations are called the ſyſtems of natural law, of natural religion, meaning the law and religion which force themſelves upon the minds of every honeſt and ſober man who ſeriouſly ſets himſelf about a candid and rational enquiry into the nature, reaſon and relation of things. The ſame ſtill ſmall voice which renders a man a true ſon of liberty in politicks will render him a calm, patient and diſpaſſionate reaſoner upon religious ſubjects, *nullius in verba magiſtri* is the inſcription of the ſeal, with which he impreſſes all his writings. And though conſcious of his averſion to deceive, he warns people to number, weigh and meaſure after himſelf. In this there is great ſafety, for none can tell when God may take away the moſt important Eliah, and much will ſuch a one be affected at his departure, if he reflects that any part of his maſter's counſel has been kept back from the faithful ſons of the prophets he leaves behind. The perſon who could leave a number of people in a deſart without a pilot, or at ſea without a compaſs, would act exactly the part of the pretended patriot, who would willingly forego any opportunity of inſtructing all the members of the commonwealth to which he belonged in every needful article of preſervative knowledge.

An abſolute authority, an indiſputable ſtandard, muſt exiſt ſomewhere; otherwiſe conteſt muſt be perpetual. To imagine this authority repoſed in any being ſubject to error or ſiniſter deſign, is too abſurd for the ſuppoſition of a papiſt: he therefore cloaths his ſupreme pontiff with a perfection of which the ſupreme Jehovah alone is worthy. It is therefore in the nature and conſtitution of things, directed by his unerring wiſdom, we are to look for the *laws* of nature, the abſolute, perfect and unchangeable *will* of God. The immoderate love of eaſe which bruthes too many of our ſpecies, engages them to truſt the determinations of the right, the juſt, the honourable to others, in whom they place implicit confidence, and ſcorning to be thought ignorant of propoſitions they never underſtood, and conſequently can neither explain nor defend. The next ſtretch their ambition puts them upon, is to find a ſufficient power to ſilence a gainſayer by any means fair or foul. It is in this condition of things the children of wiſdom cry out for liberty of ſpeech, to defend the doctrines of their fathers! But from the days of John his celeſtial kingdom has ſuffered violence, and nothing but violence will ever defend it, more than force it. Human life is indeed a warfare, and he who will not oppoſe an invader, muſt league to become a hewer of wood and drawer of waters for the whole congregation.

The ſecurity of property and the freedom of ſpeech, ſays an eminent writer, always go together, and in thoſe wretched countries where a man cannot call his tongue his own, he can ſcarce call any thing elſe his own.

Whoever would overthrow the liberty of a nation, muſt begin by deſtroying the freedom of ſpeech, a thing terrible to public traitors, i. e. to all the enemies of civil and religious liberty.

ELEUTHERIUS.

At the Intelligence-Office,

Over against the Brick-Meſſuage, in Merchants Row,

Kept by GRANT WEBSTER,

There is to be ſold,

PHiladelphia Flour and Iron, Maryland Flour and Bread, Weſt-India and New-England Rum, Brandy, Madeira and other Wines, Briſtol beer, race and ground ginger, French Indigo, Ruſſia duck, new and ſecond-hand Veſſels of different ſizes, ſecond hand Sails and Anchors, ſeveral compleat ſets of large Scales and Weights, ſeveral genteel Houſes in town, and ſeveral good Farms in the Country (one in particular about ten miles from this town, very agreeably ſituated for a Gentleman's Seat, with a good houſe and barn on it, which will be ſold under the value for ready money) part of a very valuable Lead Mine in the county of Suffolk, a few Engliſh Goods and ſundry other articles very cheap for the caſh.

WANTED. Several Sums of Money for different perſons, who will give good ſecurity for the ſame, either real or perſonal. Likewiſe, Bills of Exchange, for which the ready money muſt be paid.

N. B. GOODS of any ſort are taken in and ſold, Bills of Exchange negociated, and any kind of Brokerage done at ſaid Office on reaſonable commiſſions.

MUSICK, and Muſical Inſtruments, viz. Harpſicords, Spinnets, Violins, Piano Fortes, Guitars, and German Flutes; to be ſold by Mr. PROFFAT, at Mrs. Holbrook's upon the Common.

A FEW Caſks of Choice new RICE, and ſeveral barrels of South-Carolina Pitch, to be ſold on board the ſloop Molly, lying at Green's wharf.

MR. JOAN's Concert, which was to be this evening, is poſtponed till Thurſday the 21ſt inſtant.

*** *Some domeſtic Intelligence, &c. are obliged to wait for want of room; A PROFESSOR ſhall have a place in our next.*

J. B. Leader and Subſcriber.

second number appeared early in August, and regularly thenceforward for six months, meeting with good success. Thomas, however, was ambitious to undertake a larger paper than had yet been printed in New England; and on March 7, 1771, the *Spy* was issued on a whole sheet, royal folio, as a new weekly publication. The title of the first number was as given in the accompanying *fac-simile;* but it appeared later between two rude cuts, — the Goddess of Liberty on the left; and on the right, two children with a basket of flowers, — and this was followed by the lines from Addison's *Cato:* —

> "Do thou, Great Liberty! inspire our souls,
> And make our lives in thy possession happy,
> Or our deaths glorious in thy just defence."

Thomas was then in his twenty-second year. His paper was at first open to Whigs and Tories alike, but his own partialities were so pronounced that the friends of the Government one by one withdrew from him. The authorities, failing to win him to their service, used all their powers to cripple and discourage him; but their threats and blandishments were alike unavailing.[1] His group of writers grew steadily bolder and more defiant. One of them, whose name has never been known, in a series of forty letters with the signature of "Centinel," discussed the issues between Parliament and the people with learning and spirit, taking for his motto the warning lines from the ballad of Chevy Chase: —

> "The child that is unborn
> Will rue the hunting of that day."

He startled even the Whigs, and alarmed not a few of them, by the boldness with which he challenged all rulers whose authority did not rest upon the natural rights of man. Other writers of like spirit poured oil, not upon the troubled waters, but upon the angry flames. Joseph Greenleaf, over the signature of "Mucius Scævola," denounced the Governor and Lieut.-Governor by name as usurpers, and invoked resistance to their authority. His letter was pronounced "the most daring production ever published in America." Thomas was prosecuted for libel, but the grand jury refused an indictment. Greenleaf was summoned to answer before the Governor and Council, but he ignored the summons, and his commission as justice of the peace was publicly cancelled. Meanwhile the *Spy* grew more bitterly hostile to the Crown and its agents, and its defiance of all restraint attracted the attention of the continent.[2] Thomas was hung in effigy in many places,

[1] "The Government hoped to buy the young printer: he was not in the market. It tried to drive him: he could not be driven. It tried to alarm him: he was without fear. It tried to suppress him; but he baffled and defeated every attempt to this end, and gained new strength and influence by every conflict." — B. F. Thomas, *Memoir of Isaiah Thomas*, p. 31.

[2] This excessive zeal was not wholly approved by the elders. John Adams, writing to his wife, July, 1774, quotes Mr. Winthrop, his companion on the eastern circuit, as complaining of the Boston press for printing accounts of every popular commotion or disturbance, while in other provinces such occurrences were very properly concealed. "Our presses in Boston, Salem, and Newburyport," he says, "are under no regulation, nor any judicious, prudent care. . . . The printers are hot, indiscreet men; and they are under the influence of others as hot, rash, and in-

and his paper was burned by the hangman. Letters scattered among the people and the soldiers in the early autumn of 1774, mentioning Adams, Bowdoin, Hancock, and others as marked for speedy destruction in the event of an outbreak, also named "those trumpeters of sedition, the printers Edes and Gill and Thomas," as not to be forgotten.

The writers for the *Spy* were more abusive and exasperating than those in the *Gazette*, but both were pursuing the same end. Thomas took his ground not merely upon the rights of the Colonies under the Charter, but upon the rights of human nature. Hancock, writing to him April 4, 1775, from the Provincial Congress, then sitting at Concord, superscribed his letter: "To Isaiah Thomas, Supporter of the Rights and Liberties of Mankind." From the time the *Spy* took its position it was resolute and uncompromising. With abstract discussions of the questions of law and right involved in the struggle, its writers mingled unsparing denunciations of Crown and Parliament, until the country was made familiar with the purpose of resistance, and in the fulness of time was eager to accept the appeal to force. The writers for the *Gazette* were more deliberate, more elaborate, and, as a rule, more highly cultivated. Their illustrations were more learned and copious. Many of them hesitated before declaring openly for independence, toward which their logic compelled them. Others, filled with fiery zeal, blazed with equal fervor.

The temper of the *Spy*, and its incessant activity, made Thomas a marked man; and he prosecuted his work at great personal peril. Just before the battle of Lexington the town became too hot even for his ardent spirit. He sent his family to Watertown early in April, and prepared to follow them. He packed his presses and types, with such movable effects as could be hastily gathered together, and on April 16 "stole them out of town in the dead of night." They were sent to Worcester, where the *Spy* reappeared on May 3 following, with the title again changed to the *Massachusetts Spy, or American Oracle of Liberty*. In its new field, separated from the great spirits who gathered round it in Boston, the *Spy* lost something of its early fire; but its influence was to the end of the contest undiminished.[1]

judicious as themselves, very often." — *Familiar Letters of John Adams and his Wife*, p. 11.

Dr. Eliot, in his *Narrative of Newspapers*, is still more censorious: "The writers [for the *Spy*] were most of them young men of genius, without experience in business or knowledge of the world; some of whom, perhaps, had no principles to actuate them, or were enthusiasts if they had principles, and wanted judgment where their virtue did not fail. . . . The same spirit and principles lead to a dissolution of all society, and, like more modern publications on equality and the rights of man, are direct attacks at all authority and law; and, being carried into effect, would have made confusion here, as they have since dissolved the government and desolated the fair fields of Europe." — *Mass. Hist. Coll.* vi. 64, 79.

[1] "The press was used by the Patriots with great activity and effect. The *Boston Gazette* and the *Massachusetts Spy* were the principal Whig journals printed this year (1773) in Boston. The *Gazette* had for a long time been the main organ of the popular party; and it was through its columns that Otis, the Adamses, Quincy, and Warren addressed the public. In fact no paper on the continent took a more active part in politics, or more ably supported the rights of the Colonies. Its tone was generally dignified, and its articles were often elaborate. The *Massachusetts Spy* was more spicy, more in the partisan spirit, less scrupulous in matter;

In the summer of 1775, the printers of the *Essex Gazette*, Ebenezer and Samuel Hall, moved from Salem to Cambridge, established their printing office in Stoughton Hall, and continued the publication under the name of the *New England Chronicle, or the Weekly Gazette*. It was intensely Whig in its sympathies, and had several accomplished contributors. Early the following year, Boston being no longer in a state of siege, the *Chronicle* was moved across the river to School Street, "next door to Oliver Cromwell's Tavern;" was bought by Edward Eveleth Powars and Nathaniel Willis, who changed the name to the *Independent Chronicle and Universal Advertiser*, and consecrated it anew to "the glorious cause of America." Samuel Adams gave his never resting pen to its service, and John Hancock was among its occasional contributors. It was ably and earnestly on the side of liberty through all the vicissitudes of the Revolution.[1]

It will be observed that the Revolutionary Press derived its chief influence from the constant use which able writers and statesmen made of it. Their spirited arguments, exhortations, and appeals were carried through its agency over every threshold, and, being copied from journal to journal in all the colonies, gave cumulative force and energy to the popular feeling. With such assistance the press, in spite of its limitations, was made to represent in a peculiar sense the form and body of the time. It was a period of prevailing intellectual as well as moral exaltation. Dreams of liberty and self-government, under new conditions, seemed at last about to be realized. The sense of national life was becoming intense and vivid. The terms America, Country, Commonwealth, Nation, came into common use, or acquired new meanings. Phrases implying or asserting a new distribution of public powers, became familiar: all men are by nature equal; kings have only delegated authority; the people may resume supreme power at their pleasure; judges are servants not of the king but of the commonwealth, and are bound by the charter. Franklin's warning before leaving England, transmitted through Lord Howe to Lord North, — "They who can give up essential liberty to obtain a little temporary safety deserve neither liberty nor safety," — became a standard maxim, and was often used in calls for public meetings and appeals to public sympathy. Books on personal and public rights, treatises on government, standard writings on canon and public law, were more and more sought for. Milton, Harrington, Sydney, Marvell, and Locke were favorite authors. Bacon and Bolingbroke were often quoted. Montesquieu and Priestley had many disciples; cheap reprints of their works were extant before and during the Revolution.[2]

aimed less at elegance of composition than at clear, direct, and efficient appeal." — Frothingham, *Rise of the Republic*, p. 51.

[1] [For some account of magazines and other periodical publications of this time, see "The Press and Literature of the Provincial Period," in Vol. II. p. 387. See also S. F. Haven, *Am. Antiq. Soc. Proc.*, October, 1871. — Ed.]

[2] "I have been told by an eminent bookseller that in no branch of his business, after tracts of popular devotion, were so many books as those on the law exported to the plantations. The colonists have now fallen into the way of printing them for their own use. I hear that they have sold nearly as many of Blackstone's Commentaries in America as in England." — Edmund Burke, in the House of Commons, March 22, 1775.

[Vol. IX.] THE [Numb 429]

INDEPENDENT CHRONICLE. AND THE UNIVERSAL ADVERTISER.

THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 7, 1776.

MASSACHUSETTS-STATE. BOSTON: PRINTED BY
POWARS AND WILLIS, Opposite the NEW Court-House.

From the PENNSYLVANIA JOURNAL, Oct. 9.

The CONSTITUTION, *of the* COMMONWEALTH *of* PENNSYLVANIA, *as established by the* GENERAL CONVENTION, *elected for that purpose, and held at* PHILADELPHIA, *July 15th, 1776, and continued by adjournments to September 28, 1776.*

WHEREAS all government ought to be instituted and supported for the security and protection of the community as such, and to enable the individuals who compose it to enjoy their natural rights and the other blessings which the author of existence has bestowed upon man; and whenever these great ends of government are not obtained, the people have a right by common consent, to change it, and take such measures as to them may appear necessary to promote their safety and happiness. AND WHEREAS the inhabitants of this Common Wealth have, in consideration of protection only, heretofore acknowledged allegiance to the King of Great Britain, and the said King has not only withdrawn that protection, but commenced and still continues to carry on, with unabated vengeance, a most cruel and unjust war against them, employing therein not only the troops of Great Britain, but foreign mercenaries, savages, and slaves, for the avowed purpose of reducing them to a total and abject submission to the despotic domination of the British Parliament, with many other acts of tyranny, (more fully set forth in the declaration of Congress) whereby all allegiance and fealty to the said King and his successors are dissolved and at an end, and all power and authority derived from him ceased in these Colonies. AND WHEREAS it is absolutely necessary for the welfare and safety of the inhabitants of said Colonies, that they be reconstituted free and independent States, and that just, permanent, and proper Forms of Government exist to every part of them, derived from, and founded on the authority of the people only, agreeable to the directions of the honorable American Congress WE, the representatives of the Freemen of Pennsylvania, in General Convention met, for the express purpose of framing such a Government, confiding the goodness of the great Governor of the Universe (who alone knows to what degree of earthly happiness mankind may attain by perfecting the arts of Government) in permitting the people of this State, by common consent, and without violence, deliberately to form for themselves such just rules as they shall think best for governing their future society; and being fully convinced that it is our indispensable duty to establish such original principles of Government as will best promote the general happiness of the people of this State and their posterity, and provide for future improvements, without partiality for, or prejudice against any particular class, sect, or denomination of men whatever, DO, by virtue of the authority vested in us by our constituents, ordain, declare, and establish the following Declaration of Rights and Frame of Government, to be THE CONSTITUTION of this Common-Wealth, and to remain in force therein forever, unaltered, except in such articles as shall hereafter on experience be found to require improvements, and which shall by the same authority of the people, fairly delegated as this Frame of Government directs, be amended or improved for the more effectual obtaining and securing THE GREAT END AND DESIGN OF ALL GOVERNMENT, herein before mentioned.

CHAPTER I.

A DECLARATION of the Rights of the Inhabitants of the State of PENNSYLVANIA.

I THAT all men are born equally free and independent, and have certain natural, inherent and unalienable rights, amongst which are the enjoying and defending life and liberty, acquiring, possessing and protecting property, and pursuing and obtaining happiness and safety.

II. That all men have a natural and unalienable right to worship Almighty God, according to the dictates of their own consciences and understanding: And that no man ought or of right can be compelled to attend any religious worship, or erect or support any place of worship, or maintain any ministry, contrary to, or against, his own free will and consent: Nor can any man, who acknowledges the being of a God, be justly deprived or abridged of any civil right as a citizen, on account of his religious sentiments or peculiar mode of religious worship. And that no authority can or ought to be vested in, or assumed by, any power whatever, that shall in any case interfere with, or in any manner controul, the right of conscience in the free exercise of religious worship.

III That the people of this State have the sole, exclusive and inherent right of governing and regulating the internal police of the same.

IV That all power being originally inherent in, and consequently derived from, the People; therefore all officers of Government, whether legislative or executive, are their trustees and servants, and at all times accountable to them.

V That Government is, or ought to be, instituted for the common benefit, protection and security of the people, nation or community, and not for the particular emolument or advantage of any single man, family or set of men who are a part only of that community. And that the community hath an indubitable, unalienable and indefeasible right to reform, alter or abolish Government in such manner as shall be by that community judged most conducive to the public weal.

VI. That those who are employed in the legislative and executive business of the State may be restrained from oppression, the people have a right, at such periods as they may think proper, to reduce their public officers to a private station, and supply the vacancies by certain and regular elections.

VII. That all elections ought to be free, and that all free men having a sufficient evident common interest with, and attachment to the community, have a right to elect officers, or be elected into office.

VIII. That every member of society hath a right to be protected in the enjoyment of life, liberty and property, and therefore is bound to contribute his proportion towards the expence of that protection, and yield his personal service, when necessary, or an equivalent thereto. But no part of a man's property can be justly taken from him, or applied to public uses, without his own consent, or that of his legal representatives. Nor can any man who is conscientiously scrupulous of bearing arms, be justly compelled thereto, if he will pay such equivalent. Nor are the people bound by any laws, but such as they have in like manner assented to, for their common good.

IX That in all prosecutions for criminal offences, a man hath a right to be heard by himself and his council, to demand the cause and nature of his accusation, to be confronted with the witnesses, to call for evidence in his favour, and a speedy public trial, by an impartial jury of the country, without the unanimous consent of which he cannot be found guilty. Nor can he be compelled to give evidence against himself. Nor can any man be justly deprived of his liberty, except by the laws of the land or the judgment of his peers.

X That the people have a right to hold themselves, their houses, papers and possessions free from search or seizure, and therefore warrants without oaths or affirmations first made, affording a sufficient foundation for them, and whereby any officer or messenger may be commanded or required to search suspected places, or to seize any person or persons, his or their property, not particularly described, are contrary to that right, and ought not to be granted.

XI That in all controversies respecting property, and in suits between man and man, the parties have a right to trial by jury, which ought to be held sacred.

XII That the people have a right to freedom of speech, and of writing and publishing their sentiments; therefore the freedom of the press ought not to be restrained.

XIII That the people have a right to bear arms for the defence of themselves and the State, and as standing armies, in time of peace, are dangerous to liberty, they ought not to be kept up: And that the military should be kept under strict subordination to, and governed by, the civil power.

XIV That a frequent recurrence to the fundamental principles, and a firm adherence to justice, moderation, temperance, industry, and frugality, are absolutely necessary to preserve the blessings of liberty, and keep a Government free; The people ought therefore to pay particular attention to these points, in the choice of officers and representatives, and have a right to exact a due and constant regard to them, from their legislators and magistrates in making and executing such laws as are necessary for the good Government of the State.

XV That all men have a natural inherent right to emigrate from one State to another that will receive them, or to form a new State in vacant countries, or to such countries as they can purchase, whenever they think that thereby they may promote their own happiness.

XVI. That the people have a right to assemble together, to consult for their common good, to instruct their representatives, and apply to the legislature for redress of grievances, by address, petition or remonstrance.

CHAPTER II.

PLAN or FRAME of GOVERNMENT.

Section 1. THE Common-Wealth or State of Pennsylvania shall be governed hereafter by an Assembly of the Representatives of the Freemen of the same, and the President and Council, in manner and form following—

Sect. 2 The supreme legislative power shall be vested in a House of Representatives of the Freemen of the Common-Wealth or State of Pennsylvania.

Sect. 3 The supreme executive power shall be vested in a President and Council.

Sect 4 Courts of Justice shall be established in the city of Philadelphia and in every county of this State.

Sect 5 The Freemen of this Common-Wealth and their sons shall be trained and armed for its defence, under such regulations, restrictions and exceptions as the General Assembly shall by law direct, preserving always to the people the right of chusing their Colonel and all commissioned officers under that rank in such manner and as often as by the said laws shall be directed.

Sect 6. Every freeman of the full age of twenty-one years, having resided in this State for the space of one whole year next before the day of election for Representatives, and paid public taxes during that time, shall enjoy the right of an elector: Provided always, that sons of freeholders of the age of twenty-one years shall be entitled to vote although they have not paid taxes.

Sect 7 The House of Representatives of the Freemen of this Common-Wealth shall consist of persons most noted for wisdom and virtue, to be chosen by the Freemen of every city and county of this Common-Wealth respectively. And no person shall be elected unless he has resided in the city or county for which he shall be chosen, two years immediately before the said election, nor shall any member while he continues such, hold any other office except in the militia.

Sect 8. No person shall be capable of being elected a member to serve in the House of Representatives of the Freemen of this Common-Wealth more than four years in seven.

Sect 9. The members of the House of Representatives shall be chosen annually by ballot by the Freemen of the Common-Wealth, on the second Tuesday

Of the group of writers brought to the front at this time, partly by the force of events and partly by their own genius, Samuel Adams was the master spirit. From his youth he was deeply interested in public affairs. He read with avidity all attainable books on politics and government, and early made himself familiar with Roman law and political history. He formed a club in 1748 for the purpose of writing and debate on the great interests of the country. Inspired by his example the members gave to these discussions the enthusiasm of youthful ambition, and were stimulated by them to the attainment of broader views and the pursuit of profounder studies. Every invasion of chartered rights, committed or threatened, found Adams and his companions at their posts. The habit of enlisting young men of talent and spirit in the support of principles dear to him continued during his active life. "To my certain knowledge," said John Adams,[1] "from 1758 to 1775 he made it his constant rule to watch the rise of every brilliant genius; to seek his acquaintance, to court his friendship, to cultivate his natural feelings in favor of his native country, to warn him against the hostile designs of Great Britain, and to fix his affections and reflections on the side of his native country." Besides his contributions to the newspapers, already spoken of, the vigorous pen of Samuel Adams was always at the public service. He drafted the instructions to the Boston representatives for 1764 and 1765, containing the first public challenge of the right of Parliament to tax the Colonies without their consent, and the first public suggestion of the union of the Colonies for the redress of grievances. In his representative capacity he suggested or prepared many of the state papers of that period, and made many public addresses. With the single exception of a reply to Thomas Paine, in defence of Christianity, his writings were called forth in the regular course of public service, and were addressed to the pressing political exigencies of the time. The generation following named him "The Father of the Revolution." His blameless life, his unfailing intelligence, his persuasive address, his enthusiasm, always controlled by reason and a religious sense of responsibility, combined to make him a born leader of men.[2]

The impetuous genius of James Otis supplied what was wanting in Adams's well poised temperament. He was an accomplished scholar, a charming speaker, and richly endowed with dashing and brilliant qualities. His first published work (1760) was a treatise on *The Rudiments of Latin Prosody*, with a dissertation on the principles of harmony in composition. He prepared a similar work on Greek prosody, which was never published. The following year, 1761, he was called to take the leading part in the great trial of the Writs of Assistance.[3] Here his remarkable gifts had a fair and adequate field for their exercise. The trial involved not only great pecuniary interests, but the political and civil rights of a continent, and

[1] John Adams's Correspondence, in *Works*, x. 364.

[2] Wells, *Life and Public Services of Samuel Adams;* Hutchinson, *History of Massachusetts Bay.* [See portrait and references in chapter i. of the present volume. — Ed.]

[3] [See Mr. Porter's chapter in the present volume. — Ed.]

gave ample opportunity for the display of his varied learning, masterly reasoning, and captivating eloquence. From this time forward he knew neither rest nor peace. In 1762, after a sharp controversy with Governor Bernard on a question of his right to authorize expenditures without the knowledge of the House of Representatives, in which Otis was sustained by the House, he published a spirited vindication of its action, which still further stimulated the spirit of resistance to executive power.[1] This fugitive pamphlet contained the fundamental argument on which constitutional liberty rests, and presented in clear array the whole armory of reasoning with which the statesmen of the Revolution fought their later battles. This was followed two years later by *The Rights of the Colonies Asserted and Vindicated*, written with ability and spirit, but making apparent concessions to the authority of Parliament, which excited great distrust and caused a loss of confidence in the steadiness of his judgment which was never fully recovered. His last work appeared in 1765,[2] an eminently patriotic and useful contribution to the discussion; but presenting views concerning a consolidated empire and parliamentary representation of the colonies, not shared by many persons on either side of the contest. In his profession Mr. Otis was pre-eminent, and until his reason failed was distinguished among many accomplished and able men.[3]

The fruitful pen of John Adams, like that of his illustrious kinsman, was given to the same absorbing cause. While reading law in Worcester he had access to most of the standard books with which educated men were expected to be familiar. Frequent references to them in his letters and diary indicate much proficiency in both the ancient and recent classics. The argument of James Otis against the Writs of Assistance, to which he was a listener, was a fresh revelation to his wonderfully receptive and fertile mind.[4] Thenceforward, till the crisis culminated in 1776, he was engaged, with occasional interruptions, in writing for the newspapers, in preparing instructions for representatives, in addressing public meetings or representative bodies, — wherever, indeed, the cause of the colonies needed an able, learned, and fearless defender. In 1765 he was one of a sodality, consisting of two young lawyers besides himself, formed under the patronage of Mr.

[1] The title was, *A Vindication of the Conduct of the H. of Rep. of the Province of the Mass. Bay*, printed by Edes & Gill, 1762. J. Adams, writing of it many years after, said: "Look over the Declaration of Rights and Wrongs, issued by Congress in 1774; look into the Declaration of Independence, in 1776; look into the writings of Dr. Price and Dr. Priestley; look into all the French constitutions of government; and, to cap the climax, look into Thomas Paine's *Common Sense*, *Crisis*, and *Rights of Man*, — what can you find that is not to be found in solid substance in this vindication of the House of Representatives?"

[2] *Considerations on behalf of the Colonists, in a Letter to a Noble Lord.* London: printed for J. Almon, 1765.

[3] Tudor, *Life of James Otis*; *Life and Works of John Adams*; Hutchinson, *History of Massachusetts Bay*. Mercy Warren, *History of the American Revolution*; *Monthly Anthology*, v. [See a portrait and references in chapter i. — Ed.]

[4] "From early life the bent of his mind was toward politics, a propensity which the state of the times, if it did not create, doubtless very much strengthened. Public subjects must have occupied the thoughts and filled up the conversation in the circles in which he then moved; and the interesting questions at that time arising could not but seize on a mind like his, ardent, sanguine, and patriotic." — Webster, *Oration on Adams and Jefferson*, Boston, Aug. 2, 1826.

Gridley, then advanced in years, for the purpose of studying the leading writers on oratory and civil law. His first published work, a treatise on the canon and feudal law, was the result of their discussions in 1765, and was printed after the mob of that year. In the *Gazette* he wrote under many signatures on all the leading questions; and though his attachment to his profession made him resolve again and again to forswear politics, he returned to the public arena as often as an excuse was offered. From this time Mr. Adams was fully embarked in public life, and his work and service belong to the general history of the country. His writings of the period preceding and during the Revolution were very carefully preserved, and have been published, with his own later commentaries upon the events which inspired them.[1]

The appearance of British soldiers in Boston, in 1768, was the signal for a fresh appeal to the patriotism of the inhabitants, the boldness and brilliancy of which startled friends and foes. Josiah Quincy, Jr., then just admitted to the bar, published in the *Gazette* of that year the remarkable series of essays bearing the signature of "Hyperion," which at once inspired admiration for his genius and the affectionate interest of all friends of liberty. His defence of the soldiers of the Boston massacre, against the current of popular feeling which he had himself been active in creating, gave further proof of his personal courage and his deep sense of justice. His contributions to the newspapers, and his correspondence with leading statesmen, continued after he was smitten with the signs of fatal illness; and his persuasive and eloquent voice was often heard in public gatherings. His chief work, *Observations on the Boston Port Bill*, with reflections on civil society and standing armies, published in 1774, increased his reputation and influence. But the great promise of his youth and early manhood was not to be realized. He fell on the threshold of the conflict, leaving a pure and noble memory.[2]

Joseph Warren, like most of his eminent contemporaries, also cultivated literature as a patriotic diversion. With every social grace and virtue he united uncommon literary gifts and a passionate love of country. Indeed, they were never long separated. His letters were luminous and prophetic, and his newspaper writings, from the time of the Stamp Act to the close of his life, were noted for purity and force of style, excellent judgment, and a manly spirit. His oration on the anniversary of the Massacre, in 1772, gave fresh lustre to his reputation. He was then in his thirty-first year, in active practice of his profession, and the trusted friend and confidant of all the Whig statesmen. His style was fervent and rhetorical, somewhat over-

[1] C. F. Adams, *Life and Works of John Adams*. [A portrait of John Adams in his old age is given in Mr. Lodge's chapter in the present volume. — Ed.]

[2] J. Quincy, *Life of Josiah Quincy, Jr.* In his will was the following provision: "I give to my son Josiah [afterward President Quincy], when he shall have arrived at the age of fifteen years, Algernon Sydney's works, in a large quarto; John Locke's works, in three volumes, folio; Lord Bacon's works, in four volumes, folio; Gordon's Tacitus, in four volumes; Cato's Letters, by Gordon; and Trenchard's and Mrs. Macaulay's History of England. May the Spirit of Liberty rest upon him!" [See his portrait and references in chapter i. — Ed.]

weighted with metaphor and imagery, but frank and sincere in thought, logical and direct in statement, and impressive in delivery. The oration of



My ever honored Fellow Citizens,

It is not without the most humiliating conviction of my want of ability that I now appear before you. The sense I have of the obligation I am under to obey the call of my country at all times, together with an animating recollection of your indulgence exhibited upon so many occasions, has induced me once more, undeserving as I am, to throw myself upon that candor which looks with kindness on the feeblest efforts of an honest mind.

You will not now expect the elegance, the learning, the just, the enrapturing strains of eloquence which charm you when a Lovell, a Church or a Hancock speaks; but you will permit me to say that with a sincerity equal to theirs I mourn over my bleeding country: with them I weep at her distress, and with them deeply resent the wrongs which she has suffered from the hands of cruel and ungodly men.

That personal freedom is the natural right of every man, and that property, or an exclusive right to dispose of

WARREN'S 1775 MANUSCRIPT.[1]

1775 was given under circumstances much more singular and distressing. The town was occupied by hostile troops. Warning had been given that

[1] [The manuscript of this second oration of Warren has descended to Dr. John C. Warren, the second of that name, and by his kind permission the first page of it is here reproduced. The script is of uncommon legibility, contained in a quarto book with black or dark covers, and occupies twenty-eight pages, with one paragraph at least inserted on an attached bit of paper. The oration was printed in the *Boston Gazette*, March 17, 1775, and in the same year in a pamphlet by Edes & Gill, and probably the same year in New York. (Frothingham's *Warren*, 428–436.) Dr. Warren also possesses, beside the likeness mentioned in another note, a contemporary colored mezzotint portrait, following evidently the likeness in question; and in his dining-room, above the portrait, hang two swords crossed, — one a slender blade sheathed in black, which is believed to have been the one worn at Bunker Hill; the other was worn for many years by his grandfather as an officer of the Cadets. Dr. Warren possesses various papers of the General and some of his books, which have a printed book-plate: "Joseph Warren. The wicked borroweth and returneth not." See the portrait and references in chapter i. — ED.]

the citizens would commemorate the day at their peril. Warren, with characteristic spirit, sought the post of danger. To avoid the crowd, he reached the pulpit through a window in the rear of it. On the steps of the pulpit and in the pews before him were the military representatives of an empire whose power he met with audacious defiance. The chivalry of his nature had full play in this remarkable presence. Poetry and history have attempted to describe the scene; but no description can give adequate expression to its impressiveness and significance.

In the intervals of these periods of special exaltation, Warren wrote stirring verses for the newspapers, of which "A Song for Liberty," beginning —

> "That seat of science, Athens, and earth's proud mistress, Rome, —
> Where now are all their glories? We scarce can find their tomb,"

is perhaps the best known.[1]

With these Patriots, who are most eminent in the literary annals of the Revolution, were many others whose names are not wholly foreign to them. James Bowdoin published little aside from his contributions to the state papers; but he cultivated letters during his whole life, and his reputation for science and learning extended over both continents.[2] John Hancock, eloquent, graceful, and accomplished, and "formed by nature to act a brilliant part in the affairs of the world," contributed much to the correspondence of the time, and gave an oration in 1774, on the anniversary of the Massacre, in which he rose to the occasion with boldness and dignity.[3] Robert Treat Paine, the learned and eminent judge, had refined literary tastes, and cultivated the society of learned men. He was wise in theology as well as in law, but the tradition of his great acquirements is all that is left concerning them.[4] Oxenbridge Thacher, the associate of Otis in the trial of the Writs of Assistance, an ingenious lawyer, a cultivated scholar, and of a most amiable character, died early in the strife, just as his fine spirit and rich gifts were beginning to be appreciated. William Tudor, who attained eminence at the bar, served with distinction in the army, and delivered the spirited Massacre oration of 1779.[5] Thomas Cushing was a diligent promoter of learning and literature; but his position, as Speaker of the





[1] *Massachusetts Spy*, May 26, 1774. Reprinted in Frothingham's *Life and Times of Joseph Warren*, p. 405. Duyckinck, *Cyclopedia of American Literature*, i. 466, gives a different version.

[2] Judge Lowell, quoted by R. C. Winthrop, *Orations and Addresses*, i. 131. [See Mr. Lodge's chapter. — Ed.]

[3] Sparks's *Biographies; Lives of the Signers of the Declaration of Independence;* Thacher's *Funeral Sermon:* Loring's *Hundred Boston Orators.*

[4] Washburn, *Judicial History of Massachusetts;* Tudor, *Life of James Otis.* [See the chapters by Mr. Porter and Mr. Lodge in the present volume, and by Mr. Quincy in Vol. IV. — Ed.]

[5] [There is a portrait of Colonel Tudor in *Mass. Hist. Soc. Proc.*, i. 282, and an extended memoir of him by his son in 2 *Mass. Hist. Coll.* viii. 285.—Ed.]

House for many years, in which he was required to sign all public documents, gave his name a celebrity quite out of proportion to his real influence, which, indeed, was not slight.[1] Benjamin Church, the accomplished physician, poet, scholar, and a writer of undoubted genius, gave his talents to the Whig cause, and was a trusted associate of the Whig leaders until the war began, — for a considerable time, indeed, after he had secretly resolved to betray them.[2] His writings were much celebrated. His poems, sometimes satirical, sometimes serious and pathetic, were always correct and elegant. His orations were polished, scholarly, and eloquent.[3] His prose writings, scattered through the publications of the time, were often witty and philosophical, but never especially profound.

Foremost among the writers on the royalist side was Thomas Hutchinson. Many of his state papers were written with singular moderation and dignity.[4] The royal prerogative had no more able and learned defender than it found in this favored son of the province. Had he fallen upon more peaceful times, he would easily have attained the fame to which his varied accomplishments and his blameless character entitled him; but his overestimate of power, his want of sympathy with popular rights, and his great ambition led him to the losing side of the controversy which had to be decided in his time. The storm of obloquy falling upon all who shared his faith in the power of the Crown quite overshadowed his undoubted claims to respect as a citizen, a magistrate, and an historian. In various public capacities he had rendered useful service to the Province. He was a capable and upright judge. His charges to the jury were models of clear and methodical statement, and his decisions were founded upon principles of justice and reason. His historical labors do not display original or profound thought, and have few graces of style; but he was conscientiously painstaking and thorough in his investigations, and to the relation of events involving strong partisan feeling he brought a spirit of candor which disarms criticism. The impartiality of his narrative, even in relating incidents of which he was himself a great part, and by whose interpretations he must stand or fall, is one of the striking features of his *History of Massachusetts*

[1] This circumstance led Dr. Johnson, in his pamphlet on *Taxation no Tyranny*, to say: "One object of the Americans is said to be to adorn the brows of Mr. Cushing with a diadem." [Thomas Cushing was Lieut.-Governor, under the new constitution of 1780, till his death in 1788. He was the last to add to his pay as one of the council the salary of that sinecure office, the captaincy of the Castle. See his likeness, etc., in Mr. Porter's chapter.— Ed.]

[2] Hutchinson, Letters to Bernard, January, 1772.

[3] Thacher's *Medical Biography;* Loring's *Hundred Boston Orators.*

[4] The more important of these papers are preserved in the volume of *Massachusetts State Papers*, compiled by Alden Bradford, and printed in Boston in 1818. The volume includes the speeches of the Governors of Massachusetts from 1765 to 1775, and the answers to them by the House of Representatives, with the resolutions and addresses for that period, and other public papers.

Bay. His greed of office, his exaggerated ambition, his persistent misjudgment of the nature of the forces contending for the mastery of this continent, were followed by quick and bitter retribution; but no record of his time is complete which fails to recognize him as one of the very few Americans who, outside of the absorbing interests of the time, made permanent and useful contributions to the history of the country.[1]

Jonathan Sewall, Attorney-General of Massachusetts, was reputed to be one of the best writers of his time in New England. The Royalist journals were indebted to him for many of the ingenious essays in defence of the Crown and Parliament, which enabled them to maintain their ground against great odds from 1768 to 1775. John Adams, his early friend and companion, credits him with a lively wit, a pleasing humor, a brilliant imagination, great subtilty of reasoning, and an insinuating eloquence. Andrew Oliver,[2] Lieut.-Governor, was a temperate and judicious writer in support of the prerogative, and against the extreme pretensions of the Patriots. His son, Andrew Oliver, Jr., more of a scholar than a politician, found time, in the midst of political distractions, to publish treatises on comets, storms, and other natural phenomena; and he was a member of many learned societies.

The names of two women, from very different walks in life, are entitled to a place in the literary annals of this time. "It was fashionable to ridicule female learning," Mrs. Adams wrote in one of her letters. "In the best families it went no further than writing and arithmetic; in some few and rare instances, music and dancing."[3] But Mercy Warren was no slave to the social code. Urged by her own intrepid spirit, and stimulated by the example of her brother, James Otis, and her husband, James Warren of Plymouth, she became no indifferent part of the Revolution. Her house was the resort of all its great leaders, and she was a welcome companion in their most secret counsels. Her first publications were *The Adulator*, issued in Boston in 1773, and *The Group* in 1775,—both political dramas satirizing the prominent Royalists. These were followed by poems, less elaborate and of a more serious cast; not remarkable as poetry, but charged with patriotic feeling and closely reflecting the spirit of the times. *The Squabble of the Sea Nymphs*, celebrating the tea adventure; *A Political Reverie*, written while the Colony was hesitating between its ancient loyalty and its passion for freedom; *To the Hon. John Winthrop, Esq.*, who had requested her to give him a poetical list of the articles which a lady would require under the head of "real necessaries of life," while trade with Great Britain was suspended; and later than any of these, *The Sack of Rome*, and *The Ladies of Castile*, — all won great praise in their day and were widely read.[4] Mrs. Warren kept at the same time a careful record of public events, and maintained an active correspondence with many Whig statesmen, which at a

[1] [See his likeness and an estimate of him in Dr. Ellis's chapter in Vol. II. p. 68; also Mr. Porter's chapter in the present volume. — Ed.]

[2] [See his likeness and references in Mr. Porter's chapter. — Ed.]

[3] *Familiar Letters of John Adams and his Wife*, x. xi.

[4] *Poems, Dramatic and Miscellaneous*. By Mrs. M. Warren. Boston: Thomas & Andrews, 1790.

later period furnished the principal materials for her history of the Revolution.[1]

Phillis Wheatley, a waif brought to these shores in a slave-ship from the coast of Africa, wrote youthful verses, which at first attracted attention rather on account of the novelty of their origin than for any special merit of


I am very affectionately your Friend
Phillis Wheatley
Boston March 21. 1774.

their own. Her earlier poems were first published in England, whither she had been taken in 1773 in ill health, at the age of eighteen years. These poems, gratefully inscribed to the Countess of Huntingdon, her chief friend and benefactor, and subsequently republished in this country, are of various degrees of merit, — the best of them being simple, graceful, and not without traces of genuine poetic and religious feeling. Her memorial verses on the death of Dr. Sewall, of George Whitefield, and of Governor Hutchinson's daughter, and others, were well calculated to win the sympathetic interest of many persons; while her more ambitious poems, "Goliath of Gath," "Niobe Mourning for her Children," and her contemplative and religious poems show great purity of sentiment and unusual gifts of poetic expression. Poverty, neglect, and a tragic death following a melancholy marriage quenched the fire just as it was beginning to light her way to hope and fame.[2]

But the crowning achievement of this period, — the *magnum opus*, to which the ripest thought, the highest aspiration, and the best literary skill of that generation contributed, — were the Massachusetts Constitution and Declaration of Rights of 1780. No worthier monument exists to the intellectual elevation, as well as to the wisdom, sagacity, and breadth of view of the statesmen who modelled and the people who accepted it. John and Samuel Adams, Bowdoin, Hancock, Lowell, Parsons, Cabot, Sullivan, Cushing, and many more had a part in the work; but John Adams was the

[1] Mrs. Ellet, *Women of the Revolution;* Duyckinck, *Cyclopedia of American Literature: Life and Works of John Adams.* [See Mr. Charles A. Cummings's chapter in the present volume, and Mrs. Ednah D. Cheney's chapter in Vol. IV. — Ed.]

[2] *Memoir and Poems of Phillis Wheatley, a Native African and a Slave.* Boston: George W. Light, 1834; Allibone, *Dictionary of Authors;* Duyckinck, *Cyclopedia of American Literature; Mass. Hist. Soc. Proc.*, 1863, 1864, pp. 166, 167 [where will be found various letters by her, edited by Charles Deane, with an account of her by N. B. Shurtleff. The memoir of the 1834 publication was written by Miss M. M. Odell, of Jamaica Plain. The book passed to a second edition in 1835, and to a third in 1838, the latter containing Phillis's letter to Washington, from Sparks, iii. 297. The original edition of her "Poems on various subjects" was published in London in 1773, with an engraved portrait, and it was sold in Boston by Feb. 8, 1774. Other editions were published at Albany in 1793; at Philadelphia, 1801, as an appendix to *The Negro equalled by few Europeans;* at Walpole, N. H., 1802; at Hartford, 1804; and "New England," 1816. See Mrs. Cheney's chapter in Vol. IV. — Ed.]

chief architect. The distinguishing feature of this instrument, especially worthy of commemoration here, is the chapter relating to the University of Cambridge, the encouragement of literature, etc., which remains to this day a part of the supreme law of Massachusetts, — at once a model of literary expression and the high-water mark of American statesmanship.[1]

This rapid sketch omits many names and many books entitled to a place in any complete review of the literature of the Revolutionary period. The teeming intellectual fertility of the town itself was stimulated by Thomas Hollis, Nicholas Boylston, Thomas Hancock, and a score of enterprising booksellers who brought or sent into the colony all the standard books on law, politics, and history, together with the best of the belles-lettres then read by the English-speaking world. The printers, moreover, on both sides of the controversy, responded to the spreading interest in public affairs, and poured out pamphlets and broad-sides, which found their way to every man's door. Stately and elaborate essays alternated with the light and ephemeral humors of the passing hour, presenting in every variety of form, and with every shade of feeling, the one leading thought of American intellectual or literary life. On the Loyalist side, under the greatest possible discouragements, there were displayed ability, sincerity, devotion, and many noble virtues which will always command human sympathy. On the Patriot side, while the people were equally disinterested and courageous, the love and the hope of freedom took more passionate and complete possession of them. All social and public interests came under the sway of that impulse; all talents were quickened and uplifted by that conviction. The long travail of a people contending against powerful injustice; the assurance that success would ultimately vindicate and reward their faith; passing moods of depressing doubt and triumphant confidence, alternating with dreams of grandeur and happiness under new institutions, over which kingly power would have no control and lingering tyrannies would cast no shadow, — these were the accompaniments of a political change wrought in a single generation, which in purity of motive, exaltation of purpose, and splendor of results is without parallel in the annals of men.

Delano A. Goddard

[1] "In all the formulas of rights adopted by the several States there is a general resemblance of substance and phraseology. . . . The Massachusetts Declaration is more extended, and enunciates more in detail the investiture of the liberties of the citizen subject; and though I must unavoidably be suspected of bias, I am free to express the opinion that, as a whole, it is superior to any other similar form in existence for its comprehensive projecting of the eclectic lessons of history over the future of a new Commonwealth, for its repeated inculcation of the duties of religion and education as the primary agencies of civilized States, and for its own simple and solid literature. With the exception of the third article it is the work of Mr. Adams, though in the convention it took on considerable changes in the grouping and phraseology." Alexander H. Bullock, *The Centennial of the Massachusetts Constitution*, pp. 20, 21.

CHAPTER IV.

LIFE IN BOSTON IN THE REVOLUTIONARY PERIOD.

BY HORACE E. SCUDDER.[1]

THE struggle for personal freedom which occupied the mind of England and her colonies in the eventful last quarter of the eighteenth century was sharply accented in Boston, and the crisis which came with the Boston Port Bill was of a nature to change materially and rapidly the conditions of life in the capital of New England. The succession of hostile acts on the one side, and of retaliatory reprisals on the other, practically sealed Boston Harbor before the British navy made its fence of ships across the entrance, and the sudden check upon free commerce fell with force upon the great centre of the town's activity. At the wharves were idle vessels, in the streets were idle sailors and mechanics, and the saw and hammer which had made the ship-yards noisy were thrown aside. The withdrawal of labor was the concentration of interest upon politics, for public affairs were now more than ever closely involved with private affairs. The introduction of troops into the town increased the disorder, and it would seem as if nothing was going on but town-meetings and street rows. The glance which we get at Boston in the few years immediately preceding the outbreak of the war — through the columns of the journals, the records of the General Court and of the town — discloses a half-turbulent, excited, angry, but resolute town, where there was a constant exhibition in miniature of the conflict which was so imminent.

The resolute, not to say obstinate, temper of the town found abundant opportunity for expression, and the hand seemed always on the hilt. In 1773 the Governor and Council were to have their customary annual election dinner; and the town, in its meeting, instructed the selectmen to grant the use of Faneuil Hall only on condition that neither the commissioners of the customs and their attendants, nor the officers of the army and navy stationed at Boston for the purpose of enforcing unconstitutional acts of

[1] [Mr. Scudder published in 1876, in *Men and Manners in America One Hundred Years Ago*, a picture of life in the colonies, a third of the book being given to New England; drawing his material, without change of form, from some of the most helpful of the contemporary accounts. The recent book of Mr. Henry Cabot Lodge, *A Short History of the English Colonies in America*, 1881, gives a chapter (p. 406) to depicting the condition of life in New England just at the out-break of the war. Another general survey will be found in the introduction to *The First Century of the Republic*, New York, 1876. — ED.]

Parliament by military execution, be invited, — it being utterly against the inclination of the town that even one person who had rendered himself inimical to the rights of America should be admitted to the hall upon such an occasion.[1]

The famous non-importation agreement of 1770 struck into society; for those were days when politics and society were so closely identified that there were two camps, more strictly defined than even by religious differences afterward. The matrons entered into an agreement to drink no tea until the revenue acts were repealed. "We do strictly engage," they say, "that we will totally abstain from the use of that article (sickness excepted) not only in our respective families, but that we will absolutely refuse it if it should be offered to us on any occasion whatsoever." A fortnight afterward, that no loophole might be left, the daughters of the Patriots signed a like agreement; and the Patriot papers now began to publish, and to keep standing in their columns, the names of those shopkeepers who refused to enter the non-importation league, and they were practically excommunicated by the town. "It must evidently appear that they have preferred their own little private advantage to the welfare of America; . . . so those who afford them their countenance, or give them their custom, must expect to be considered in the same disagreeable light."[2] One frequently comes upon advertisements of dealers who offer certain goods with the assurance that these were all obtained before the non-importation agreement, and so may safely be sold and bought. Isaac Viburt publishes an indignant card because handbills have been posted charging his wife with buying tea of William Jackson. It was probably done, he declares, "to raise the resentment of the inhabitants, and to injure me in my business, which wholly depends on the employ of the merchants and traders of the town, in repairing of vessels, etc. N. B. — The occasion of Mrs. Viburt's going to Mr. Jackson's shop was, a number of shoes from Lynn was left there for her, and she called on Saturday last and took them away."[3] Such advertisements illustrate well the village-like character of the town, and the extreme sensitiveness of the people.

The sewing-circle was a miniature camp, and American ideas and industry were extolled: —

> "Last Wednesday forty-five Daughters of Liberty met in the morning at the house of the Rev. Mr. Moorhead in this town; and in the afternoon they exceeded fifty. By the evening of said day they spun two hundred and thirty-two skeins of yarn, — some very fine. Their labor and materials were all generously given to the worthy pastor. Nothing appeared in their whole conduct but love, festivity, and application. . . . Their entertainment was wholly American production except a little wine, etc. . . . The whole was concluded with many agreeable tunes and Liberty songs, with great judgment; fine voices performed and animated on this occasion in all the several parts by a number of the Sons of Liberty."[4]

[1] *Boston Town Records*, May 14, 1773.
[2] *Boston Gazette*, Jan. 1, 1770.
[3] *Boston Gazette*, Feb. 19, 1770.
[4] Ibid., May 21, 1770.

There was no mincing of matters. If a man went counter to the popular sentiment and passion he was denounced by name, and made to feel the scorn of his neighbors. The rebuke was open and public: —

"Upon a motion made and seconded, *voted* unanimously, that this town have the greatest abhorrence of one of its inhabitants, — viz., Samuel Waterhouse, — who, in defiance of the united sentiment, not only of his fellow-citizens but all his fellow-countrymen, expressed repeatedly in the votes and records of the Honorable House of Representatives of this Province, has continued to accommodate troops at this time so justly obnoxious to a free people and abhorrent to a free constitution, and thereby basely prostituted a once respectable mansion-house to the use of a main guard." [1]

There is something half petty, half sublime, in the solemn way in which the town, in measured sentence, proceeds to write down for posterity the names of those who have shown themselves unworthy townsmen. At a town-meeting held March 19, 1770, this vote was unanimously passed: —

"The merchants, not only of this metropolis but through the continent, having nobly preferred the public good to their own private emolument, and with a view to obtain a redress of the grievance so loudly and justly complained of, having almost unanimously engaged to suspend their importations from Great Britain, — a measure approved by all orders as legal, peaceable, and most likely of all others to effect the salutary design in view, and which will be regarded by posterity with veneration, for the disinterested and truly public spirit appearing in it, — the town cannot but express their astonishment and indignation that any of its citizens should be so lost to the feelings of patriotism and the common interest, and so thoroughly and infamously selfish as to obstruct this very measure by continuing their importation; be it therefore solemnly *voted*, that the names of these persons — few, indeed, to the honor of the town [and then follow a dozen names, one only of which, that of John Mein, the bookseller, has any other notoriety] — be entered on the records of this town, that posterity may know who those persons were that preferred their little private advantage to the common interest of all the Colonies in a point of the greatest importance; who not only deserted, but opposed their country in a struggle for the rights of the Constitution that must ever do it honor; and who, with a design to enrich themselves, basely took advantage of the generous self-denial of their fellow-citizens for the common good."

The intimation in the last clause is of a not unnatural indignation felt and expressed by those traders who signed the agreement, and saw business falling into the hands of less zealous merchants.

Meanwhile, though foreign trade was paralyzed and the community was restless and often disorderly, the very excitement of life was doubtless a stimulus to activity in many directions. John Hancock gave the town a fire-engine, and the town, accepting it with pleasure, directed with an honest simplicity that the engine "be placed, under proper cover, at or near Hancock's Wharf; and in case of fires the estate of the donor shall have the

[1] *Boston Town Records*, March 6, 1770.



BOSTON MERCHANTS OF THE REVOLUTIONARY PERIOD.

preference of its service."[1] A number of meetings were held to take measures for lighting the town, and the result was a private subscription and the purchase of between three and four hundred lamps.[2] Two respon-

[1] *Boston Town Records*, May 22, 1772. [Several papers relating to the engines and enginemen of this time are among the old papers in the Charity Building. — Ed.]

[2] [Thomas Newell's diary notes: "March 2, 1774. — A number of lamps in town were lighted this evening for the first time." (*Mass. Hist. Soc. Proc.*, October, 1877, p. 349.) He had already (January 8) recorded: "Began to make the tops of the glass lamps for this town." The lamps had come from England, and were on board one of the tea-ships which was wrecked in December, 1773, on Cape Cod. *Mass. Hist. Soc. Proc.*, 1865, p. 327. — Ed.]



BOSTON MERCHANTS OF THE REVOLUTIONARY PERIOD.

sible persons from each ward were appointed to decide, with the committee, upon the most fitting places. Gawen Brown, whose name is familiar upon many hall clocks which are still ticking regularly, set up a great clock on the Old South, which "goes with such regularity and exactness that for this fourteen weeks it has not lost by two minutes of time."[1] In February of the same year the newspaper takes notice of the finishing of an excellent spinnet,[2] "which, for goodness of workmanship and harmony of sound, is esteemed by the best judges to be superior to any that has been imported from Europe." The protective high tariff of non-importation was evidently at work.

The order of the town was naturally disturbed by the state of affairs; and one article in the warrant for a town-meeting in March, 1770, was "to consider of some effectual methods to prevent unlicensed strangers, and other persons, from entertaining and supplying the youth and servants of the town with spirituous liquors; for the breaking up of bad houses, and removal of any disorderly intruders to the places from whence they came; and for the further discountenancing of vice and promoting a reformation of manners." A committee was appointed, but reported that the laws were sufficient, and only needed to be enforced. They advised, however, the appointment of twelve tithing-men to see to such enforcement.

The population which remained in Boston, when the town was fairly beleaguered, consisted of the garrison and its immediate camp-following; the Crown officers with their households; a small society of Tories, rich and well-bred, many of whom had sought refuge in the town;[3] a considerable body of poor people, whose sympathies were chiefly with the Patriots; and a few citizens who, belonging to the popular party, remained either to perform the duties of their offices as ministers or doctors, or to protect, as far as possible, their own property and that of their connections. It is probable that among these last would be found those whose interests were chiefly commercial, and who warily avoided committing themselves unreservedly to either side in the conflict. Our sources of information regarding the common life of the town are derived from letters, journals, and the like,[4] from representatives of these several classes, excepting the very

[1] *Boston Gazette*, April 16, 1770.

[2] [See an account of the spinnet of this time in *Harper's Magazine*, lviii. 860. — Ed.]

[3] [Most of these are named in the Editorial Note on "The Loyalists," following this chapter. — Ed.]

[4] [Such sources are the letters of John Andrews, in *Mass. Hist. Soc. Proc.*, 1865, p. 405; letters in *American Historical Record*, December, 1872; Newell's Diary, in 4 *Mass. Hist. Col.*, i.; letters in *Essex Institute Collections*, July, 1876; and Mr. W. P. Upham's paper, in *Essex Institute Bulletin*, March, 1876; Andrew Eliot's letters, in *Mass. Hist. Soc. Proc.*, September, 1878, p. 281, — too cautious to disclose much; letters to G. Greene, in Ibid., June, 1873; letter of Samuel Paine, in *N. E. Hist. and Geneal. Reg.*, July, 1876; British officer's journal, in *Atlantic Monthly*, April, 1877; *Memoir and Letters of Captain W. G. Evelyn*, 1879, from which there are some extracts in *Mass. Hist. Soc. Proc.*, 1879, p. 289. After the action at Bunker Hill, thirty-one Patriots were thrown by General Gage into the jail in Boston. Among them was James Lovell, who had delivered one of the Massacre orations. (See Loring, *Hundred Boston Orators*, p. 33). The diaries of two of these captives have been preserved: that of Peter Edes was printed in Bangor in

humble; and from the scanty chronicles preserved in the meagre *Boston News-Letter*, the only paper published in town during the siege, which was, of course, in the Tory interest. The life of which we catch glimpses was one of petty contrasts and of much common discomfort and misery. In the matter of shelter, the gentlemen and ladies of the Royal cause took possession of houses which had been deserted by prominent citizens, or were welcomed by those who remained with satisfaction in their own houses. Hancock's house [1] was occupied by General Clinton; Burgoyne was in the Bowdoin mansion; [2] and Lord Percy in the Gardiner Greene house; [3] Gage and his successor, Howe,[4] took possession, in turn, of the Province House. The officers [5] found lodgings in the aristocratic boarding-houses, which long after this period were the resort of persons who wished a more dignified and comfortable resting-place than the taverns afforded. The troops were disposed in barracks in different parts of the town; [6] and the general aspect of the place was altered by the exigencies of the situation. A number of buildings were taken down near the old Hay-Market, to permit unobstructed passage across the southern part of the peninsula, where the strongest works

1837; that of John Leach is in the *N. E. Hist. and Geneal. Reg.*, July, 1865. The manuscripts of both are owned by Mr. H. H. Edes. His letter relating to the two journals is printed in the *Mass. Hist. Soc. Proc.*, December, 1871, p. 176. See the *Evacuation Memorial*, p. 157. — Ed.]

[1] [There is in the collection of Mellen Chamberlain, Librarian of the Public Library, a paper signed by William Bant, "attorney to Mr. Hancock," dated Boston, Feb. 26, 1777, which shows the damage done to Hancock's estate by the British troops during their occupancy, "so far as I have been able to collect it," amounting to £4,732 2*s.* 8¾*d.*, of which, £345 10*s.* 6¾*d.* was damage to the mansion-house and its fences, "since April 19, 1776, taken to Dec^r 1776," including wines, furniture, "6 muskets given in to Gen^l Gage by his arbitrary order, @ 80 /," "lining of the chariot torn out and carried away, £9," "rent of the House one year, £133. 6*s.* 8*d.*" Mention is also made of a "house back of the Mansion House, pull'd down and destroyed, £300;" also "a house in Ann Street pull'd down and destroyed, £500." — Ed.]

[2] [Dr. Ellis's paper on "Burgoyne in Boston," in *Mass. Hist. Soc. Proc.*, March, 1876, p. 233, gives a synopsis of so much of Fonblanque's *Life of Burgoyne* as relates to his stay here. — Ed.]

[3] [Percy at one time occupied a fine mansion, with garden, which stood on the northerly corner of Winter and Tremont streets, and which belonged to Mr. John Williams, and had been the town residence of Governor Bernard. After the war it was the home of Samuel Breck (whose *Reminiscences* we have had, as edited by Mr. Scudder), who sold the estate to John Andrews, whose letters, however, at the time now under observation, were written from a house in School Street, where he then lived. Percy is sometimes said at different times to have occupied also the Hancock House, Mrs. Sheaffe's at the corner of Columbia and Essex streets, and perhaps others; but Mr. C. W. Tuttle (*Daily Advertiser*, May 1, 1880) says he has seen no evidence, originating in that period, of his having lived in any house but that of Mr. Williams. — Ed.]

[4] [The quarters of General Howe were, before Gage left, in a house at the corner of Oliver and Milk streets. Drake's *Landmarks*, 1872, p. 271. — Ed.]

[5] [Brigadier Pigot, of the Forty-third, "improved a house just above Liberty Tree;" but after the fight at Charlestown, his command of the troops on Bunker Hill required his residence on that side of the river. *N. E. Hist. and Geneal. Reg.*, July, 1876. Adjutant Waller's *Orderly-Book* has the following: —

"16 Aug., 1775. Whereas some evil-minded person did, on monday last, in the middle of the day, cut off the tail of a little black cow belonging to B. Gen^l Pigot, whoever will give information against the person guilty of so much cruelty shall receive a guinea reward." — Ed.]

[6] [Drake, *Landmarks*, p. 313, says that a battalion of troops was quartered in Sheriff Greenleaf's gardens, at the corner of Tremont and West streets. John Adams's house, in Queen Street (Court Street), was "occupied by one of the doctors of a regiment." It was found, after the evacuation, "very dirty, but no other damage done to it; but the few things which were left in it, all gone." *Familiar Letters*, pp. 149, 154. — Ed.]

were built for defence against possible attack.[1] The Old South was used as a riding-school for the light dragoons,—not without a contemptuous reference to the prominence of the building as a gathering-place for the seditious inhabitants,—and other meeting-houses were used for barracks. The Old North Meeting-house was pulled down for fuel, and over a hundred houses were destroyed for the same purpose; chiefly, probably, the old, small, and decaying wooden buildings.[2] There was, of course, no sentiment which would preserve the house of Governor Winthrop for a later destruction by indifferent citizens. The order for destruction was not given until necessity compelled it. Supplies of fuel had been ordered but did not arrive, and the winter set in with uncommon severity.

The customary avenues by which fuel, food, clothing, and other necessities entered the town had been closed, with the exception of the water-way into the harbor, and privateersmen were hovering about the coast harassing the transports that entered there. The town, before the siege, had taken care of itself by the ordinary dealings with the country, and by its commerce; but now it was the work of a military organization to supply the most common necessities of a large and helpless population. Suddenly to feed a town and garrison numbering together twenty thousand souls, and to be dependent chiefly upon slow-sailing vessels, coming from a distance in the inclemency of weather, was a task beyond the capacity of any common quartermaster's department; and rich and poor found themselves in a sad quandary. The testimony on this point is varied and explicit, for men become very talkative about their dinner when they have either had none or fear there is none to come; and the journals and letters of the siege are largely occupied with this topic.[3] John Andrews, one of the merchants who remained behind to have an eye on family property, and whose shrewdness and ready wit plainly stood him in good stead with both parties, makes a survey of the situation near the end of the siege: —

"I am well in health, thank God! and have been so the whole of the time, but have lived at the rate of six or seven hundred sterling a year; for I was determined to eat fresh provisions while it was to be got, let it cost what it would; that since

[1] [These works are best shown in Page's map, given in another chapter. This southern approach to the town is shown pictorially in the annexed heliotypes of two views of Boston, dating from this time; the upper is one of Des Barres's views, and the Neck lines are shown at the point where a flag flies. Something of the ruggedness of Beacon Hill is indicated in the mount beyond the town. In the lower view, which gives Shirley Hall in the middle distance on the left, Beacon Hill seems to assume an appearance which it is hard to accept. The view is much the same as the upper one, but from a point farther back from the shore. It follows a copy of a large print now in the Boston Athenæum. What seems to be the same has been not very accurately engraved in Lossing's *Washington*, and in Frank Moore's *Diary of the American Revolution*, p. 97; also as a wood-cut, in Lossing's *Field-Book of the Revolution*, i. 512. — Ed.]

[2] [The immediate occasion is said to have been to supply transports with fuel which were about to sail for England with sick. Moore's *Diary of the Revolution*, i. 182. — Ed.]

[3] ["29 May. Any women, as may be wanted as nurses at the General Hospital, or to do any other business for the service of the Garrison, and shall refuse to do it, will immediately be struck off the provision list."— Waller's *Orderly-Book*, 1775. In August, 1775, John Leach, then confined in Boston jail, enters in his diary: "This afternoon my wife came to ask my advice about signing for buying meat, as none were to have it but friends of Government." — Ed.]

October I have scarce eat three meals of salt meat, but supplied my family with fresh at the rate of one shilling to one shilling sixpence sterling the pound. What wood was to be got was obliged to give at the rate of twenty dollars a cord; and coals, though Government had a plenty, I could not procure (not being an addressor or associator[1]), though I offered so high as fifty dollars for a chaldron, and that at a season when Nabby and John, the only help I had, were under inoculation for the small-pox; that, if you'll believe me, Bill, I was necessitated to burn horse-dung. Many were the instances of the inhabitants being confined to the provost for purchasing fuel of the soldiers, when no other means offered, to keep them from perishing with cold. Yet such was the inhumanity of our masters, that they were even denied the privilege of buying the surplusage of the soldiers' rations. Though you may think we had plenty of cheese and porter, yet we were obliged to give from fifteen pence to two shillings a pound for all we ate of the former; and a loaf of bread of the size we formerly gave three pence for, thought ourselves well off to get for a shilling. Butter at two shillings. Milk — for months without tasting any. Potatoes, from nine shillings to ten shillings and sixpence a bushel; and everything else in the same strain."[2]

The besieging soldiers had a joke that the town bull, aged twenty, was killed and cut up for the use of the officers; and in a letter from one of these to his father in England, it is said: "Why should I complain of hard fate? General Gage and all his family have for this month past lived upon salt provision. Last Saturday, General Putnam, in the true style of military complaisance which abolishes all personal resentment and smooths the horrors of war when discipline will permit, sent a present to General Gage's lady of a fine quarter of veal, which was very acceptable, and received the return of a very polite card of thanks." At one time during the siege only six head of cattle were in the hands of Butcher-Master-General Hewes, as entire stock for troops or inhabitants, and the rejected portions of the slaughtered animals found purchasers among those who were both rich and dainty. One of the accounts, dated the middle of December, says: "The distress of the troops and inhabitants in Boston is great beyond all possible description. Neither vegetables, flour, nor pulse for the inhabitants, and the king's stores so very short none can be spared from them; no fuel, and the winter set in remarkably severe. The troops and inhabitants absolutely and literally starving for want of provisions and fire. Even salt provision is fifteen pence sterling per pound."[3] John Andrews, writing at one time when he was a little less cheerful than usual, did not boast of his fare: "Was it not for a trifle of salt provisions that we have, 't would be impossible for us to live. Pork and beans one day, and beans and pork another, and fish when we can catch it." He gives, frankly enough, his reason for braving all these discomforts: "Am necessitated to submit to such living, or risk the little

[1] An "addresser" was one of those, presumably Loyalists, who joined in congratulatory addresses to Gage and Howe on different occasions. An "associator" was one of the military company of Loyal American Associators, — volunteers who had offered their services to the commander-in-chief, and were enrolled under that name.

[2] *Mass. Hist. Soc. Proc.*, July, 1865.

[3] Frothingham, *Siege of Boston*, p. 280.

all I have in the world, which consists in my stock of goods and furniture, to the amount of between two and three thousand sterling, as it 's said without scruple that those who leave the town forfeit all the effects they leave behind. Whether they hold it up as only a means to detain people or not, I can't say; but, in regard to slaves, their actions have been consistent with the doctrines, however absurd. It has so far availed as to influence many to stay who would otherways have gone."

The higher life of Boston, which had made the town the spokesman for liberty, was perpetuated now outside of its limits, in Cambridge camp, and in the councils of the embryo nation; but there was still a light left burning within the besieged town, where were also the memorials of its past vitality. The very endurance of the poor tradesmen who remained, numbering among them, doubtless, some of those who at an earlier stage of the struggle had refused to build barracks for the English troops, and thus had offered their little sacrifice of wages, the privations of life which stanch Patriots bore, — these were witnesses to the indestructible spirit of the town; and it may be said that the town, whether within or without the lines, was at any time ready for the doom of destruction if that sacrifice was required. The monuments of its cherished ideas bore also a dumb testimony to the conflict which was going on. The houses of the chief citizens, occupied by prominent officers, were for the most part respected by the occupants; but that of Sam Adams, the arch-rebel, was mutilated and disfigured past his slender means of restoration. The public buildings were devoted to the uses of the soldiers. The Old South, as we have seen, was turned into a riding-school, the pulpit, pews, and seats being hacked and carried off. A beautiful carved pew, with silk furniture, belonging to Deacon Hubbard, was taken away and used for a hog-sty, according to Timothy Newell, upon the solicitation of General Burgoyne; and it is difficult not to see in some of the acts of officers and soldiers a spiteful temper. "Dirt and gravel were spread over the floors; the south door was closed; a bar was fixed, over which the cavalry leaped their horses at full speed; the east galleries were allotted to spectators; the first gallery was fitted up as a refreshment room. A stove was put up in the winter, and here were burned for kindling many of the books and manuscripts of Prince's fine library."[1] Timothy Newell's diary contains an amusing account of the shifts to which the worthy deacon resorted to evade the requisition made upon him for the use of Brattle Street Church, then recently built, and the pride of the town. He gives a sigh of relief as he records the fact that the necessity of taking down the pillars, and thus endangering the safety of the building, was all that saved the church from being used as a riding-school. It was used as a barrack. The West Church was used for barracks, and its steeple pulled down for firewood.[2] The North Church, built of wood, was pulled down for the same reason. The Federal Street Meeting-house was filled with hay. The Hollis Street Church was used for barracks. The Liberty Tree was cut

[1] Frothingham, *Siege of Boston*, p. 328. [2] [Shown in the frontispiece of this volume. — Ed.]

down amidst the jibes and taunts of the soldiers and Tories, who had not forgotten its almost personal symbolism. The most distinguished citizen who remained was the Rev. Andrew Eliot, who shared the ministerial work chiefly with Drs. Mather and Byles.[1] He was detained much against his will, but spent his time in service of the poor and sick. The Thursday Lecture gave way near the end of the siege; and Dr. Eliot notes in his diary, —

"November 30 [1775]. Preached T. L. *Coetus vere parva.* The attendance of this lecture being exceedingly small, and our work greatly increased in other respects, Dr. Mather and I, who, since the departure of our other Brethren, had preached it

THE LIBERTY TREE.[2]

alternately, thought proper to lay it down for the present. I preached the last sermon from those words in Rev. 2, 'Remember how thou hast received,' etc. An affecting occasion of laying down a lecture which had subsisted more than 140 years. The small congregation was much moved at the conclusion."

[1] [See Mr. Goddard's chapter in the present volume. — ED.]

[2] [This cut follows another given in Snow's *Boston*, p. 266. The tree stood at the southeast corner of Washington and Essex streets; and a representation of it, carved in wood, now adorns a building erected on its site by the late David Sears. The tree was felled by a party led by Job Williams, and it made fourteen cords of wood. A British soldier was killed at the time, while trying to remove one of the limbs. A soliloquy in verse, published at the time in the *Massachusetts Gazette*, Jan. 2, 1776, gives the Tory view of the case. It is reprinted in *Mass. Hist. Soc. Proc.*, March, 1876, p. 270. A pole was fastened in the tree; and the remnants of the flag used in 1775 are said to be owned by H. C. Fernald, and have been exhibited in the Old South Loan Collection. On the stump which remained a liberty-pole was erected after the war, and this was replaced by another, July 2, 1826. In 1833 Liberty-Tree Tavern stood upon the spot. Tudor's *Otis*, p. 221; Drake, *Landmarks*, p. 397; *Evacuation Memorial*, p. 160; Sargent, *Dealings with the Dead*, Nos. 41 and 42. — ED.]

The public schools were dispersed; Master Lovell, of the Latin school, casting in his lot with the Crown, while his son James, an usher in the same school, was thrown into prison under suspicion of being a spy, and carried off in chains by the army with which his father decamped as a Loyalist. One solitary school was kept gratuitously by Mr. Elias Dupee. The only other educational offer seems to have been that of Daniel McAlpine, who had been for some years established "to instruct all lovers of the noble science of defence, commonly called the back-sword, in that art."



It was dull work for the officers and ladies and gentlemen to stay cooped up in the two little peninsulas through the dismal winter, their eyes and ears assailed by the forlorn condition of the inhabitants. But no doubt there was some bravery of appearances; and the society which was lighted and warmed by scarlet coats was driven in upon itself pretty rigorously.[1] For half a century and more after this time there lived in Boston two maiden ladies, daughters of Dr. Mather Byles, who stoutly maintained to the last their loyalty to the Crown of England. They had been girls during the siege, and the war passed only to find them unflinching British subjects in will. They entertained visitors, who still remember them, with talks of the gallantry shown them by General Howe and Lord Percy during the winter of 1775–76; how they promenaded with these great men on the Common; and how Lord Percy serenaded them with the regimental band.[2] In the train of



[1] [Among other divertisements to relieve the weary hours of the siege, was their burlesquing some intercepted letters of John Adams to James Warren: "A paraphrase upon the second epistle of John the Roundhead to James the Prolocutor of the Rump Parliament." See *Works* of John Adams, i. 180; *Familiar Letters*, pp. 85, 101, 116. — Ed.]

[2] [An account of the tribulations of Dr. Byles, written by his daughter, Catharine Byles (for which we are indebted to Mr. George Hedrick, of Lowell), runs thus: —

"Oct. 13, 1778.

"Upon the first opening of the town, the people, among whom my father had officiated for forty-three years, had an irregular meeting, and desired his attendance; when a charge of his attachment to government was read, of which, as he never could obtain a copy, I am unable to give an exact account. Among others were included his friendly disposition to the British troops, particularly his entertaining them at his house, indulging them with his telescope, &c.; his prayers for the King, and for the preservation of the town during the siege. Some time after this a few lines were sent him, informing that six weeks before (without so much as the advice of any Council) he had been dismissed from his pastoral charge. Thus they left him without any support, or so much as paying his arrears, so that from the 19th of April, 1775, to this day, he has received no assistance from them. They then repaired the church, which had been occupied as a barrack for the British army, and made choice of a new pastor. In May, 1777, at a town-meeting, he was mentioned as a person inimical to America; a warrant was served and bonds given for his appearance the 2d of June, for a trial, when, as they expressed it, 'after a candid and impartial examination,' he was brought in Guilty, confined to his house and land, and a guard placed to prevent the visits of his friends; and (except the removal of the guard, which was in about two months) in this confinement has he remained ever since; and had it not been for the generous assistance of his benevolent friends, he must inevitably have suffered.

"Miss [*obscured*] presents her most respectful compliments to Mrs. [*obscured*], and, knowing her benevolence of heart, begs leave to commit the foregoing pages to her care, wishing that the particulars mentioned in this little account may thro' Mrs. [*obscured*] hands be conveyed to her humane connections."

In *Massachusetts Archives*, "Royalist," i. p. 124, is a warrant from the court, dated June 2, 1777, to deliver Mather Byles to the Board of

these great acts of gallantry must have followed similar displays; and we can easily catch sight of British officers parading on the Mall with Tory ladies. A new regiment arrived from England in December, and the *News-Letter* chirped at mention of the excellent band it brought, with promise of a concert for the diversion of the town. When the new year set in, a series of subscription balls was announced, to be held at Concert Hall once a fortnight.[1] The last ball at the Province House was the Queen's ball, given, oddly enough, on the twenty-second of February.[2] The festival of St. John the Evangelist was duly celebrated by a dinner at Freemasons' Hall, a march to Brattle Street, and an appropriate sermon; but there is no mention of any public festivity at Christmas.

Faneuil Hall, by a satirical retribution, was turned into a theatre, and the officers and other amateurs declaimed tragedy where the townsmen had held meetings of equal dramatic force and more reality of meaning. A number of officers and ladies formed a Society for Promoting Theatrical Amusements, a title which seems to give a certain solemnity to the proceedings; and they did this, the announcement frankly stated, for their own amusement and the benevolent purpose of contributing to the relief of distressed soldiers, their widows and children. The performances began at six o'clock. The entrance fee was not immoderate, — one dollar for the pit, and a quarter of a dollar for the gallery. The surplus over the expenses was to be appropriated to the relief of poor soldiers. The play must have been very popular, for the managers were obliged to announce, after a few evenings, —

"The managers will have the house strictly surveyed, and give out tickets for the number it will contain. The most positive orders are given out not to take money at the door; and it is hoped gentlemen of the army will not use their influence over the sergeants who are door-keepers to induce them to disobey that order, as it is meant entirely to promote the ease and convenience of the public by not crowding the theatre."

The tragedy of *Zara* seems to have been the favorite; and the comedy of *The Busybody*, with the farces of *The Citizen* and *The Apprentice*, were also given. The most notable piece was the local farce of *The Blockade of Boston*, by General Burgoyne.[3] On the evening of January 8 it was to

War for transportation "off the continent." There are in the Massachusetts Historical Society's Library two plans of the estate of Dr. Mather Byles, made in 1832, showing how one corner of the mansion projected into the line of the present Tremont Street, opposite Nassau (now Common) Street. See Vol. II. p. xxxix, and Mr. Goddard's chapter in the present volume. — Ed.]

[1] [The *News-Letter* of Feb. 22, 1776, contained a notice of a masquerade to be given at Concert Hall, March 11, and of "a number of different masks to be sold by almost all the milliners and mantua-makers in town." "Ten capital cooks were already engaged," it was said, for "the most brilliant thing ever seen in America." — Ed.]

[2] [John Andrews records "an innovation never before known, — a Drum or Rout, given by the admiral last Saturday evening, which did not break up till 2 or 3 o'ck on Sunday morning, their chief amusement being playing cards." *Mass. Hist. Soc. Proc.*, July, 1865, p. 323. — Ed.]

[3] Burgoyne was proud of his literary performances, of which a full account is given in chapter ix. of De Fonblanque's *Political and Military Episodes in the latter half of the Eighteenth Century, derived from the Life and Correspon-*

be given for the first time. The comedy of *The Busybody* had been acted, and the curtain was about to be drawn for the farce, when the actors behind the scenes heard an exaggerated report of a raid made upon Charlestown by a small party of Americans. One of the actors, dressed for his part (that of a Yankee sergeant), came forward upon the stage, called silence, and informed the audience that the alarm guns had been fired, and that a battle was going on in Charlestown. The audience, taking this for the first scene in the new farce, applauded obstreperously, being determined to get all the fun there was to be had out of the piece, when the order was suddenly given in dead earnest for the officers to return to their posts. The audience at this was thrown into dire confusion, the officers jumping over the orchestra, breaking the fiddles on the way; the actors rushing about to get rid of their paint and disguises; the ladies alternately fainting and screaming; and the play brought to great grief and summary conclusion. Whether it was ever given again or not does not appear; but the *News-Letter*, in reporting the incident, announced that "as soon as those parts in *The Boston Blockade*, which are vacant by some gentlemen being ordered to Charlestown, can be filled up, that farce will be performed, with the tragedy of *Tamerlane*." [1]

There was no demonstration of patriotism within the town. The *News-Letter*, a complete file of which during the siege is scarcely known, copies in its issue for July 13, from one of the outside papers, a notice by William Cooper the town clerk, calling upon the dispersed freemen of Boston to meet at Concord, in order to choose a representative to the General Court, and adds, mockingly: "Some have been wondering of late at the peaceableness of this town. It is to be hoped that their surprise will now cease, when they find that Mr. Cooper and the rest of our town-meeting folks have adjourned to Concord." [2]

dence of the Right Honorable John Burgoyne; but of his *jeux d'esprits* at this time only a few lines of a prologue and epilogue to *Zara* have been saved. His farce was probably never printed, and efforts to recover it have never, so far as I know, succeeded. After the siege, a literary revenge was taken by an anonymous writer in the farce of *The Blockheads; or the Affrighted Officers*, a not over nice production, which jeers at the situation of officers and refugees when forced to evacuate the town. The characters are —

Captain Bashard . . . . . Ad—l.
Puff . . . . . G—l.
L—d Dapper, Shallow } Officers . . . . . L—d P—y. G—t.
Dupe . . . . . Who you please.
Meagre, Surly, Brigadier Paunch, Bowny, Simple } Refugees and Friends to Government . . . G—y. R—s. B—e. M—y. E—n.
Jemima, wife to Simple.
Tabitha, her daughter.
Dorsa, her maid.
Soldiers, women, etc.

It is not difficult to supply the hiatus to the names, and read Lord Percy, Gilbert (Burgoyne perhaps is "Dupe"), Gray, Ruggles, Brattle, Murray, and Edson. Lord Percy is represented as a libertine, and there is some attempt at characterizing the several Loyalists. Brattle had the reputation of being a good liver, and Ruggles of being a rough-spoken man; but the hits in the piece were more telling to those closer to the characters in time. In the prologue are the lines —

"By Yankees frighted, too! Oh, dire to say!
Why, Yankees sure at Red-coats faint away!
Oh, yes! they thought so too, for lackaday,
Their general turned the *blockade* to a play.
Poor vain poltroons, with justice we 'll retort,
And call them blockheads for their idle sport."

[See Colonel Clapp's chapter on the "Drama in Boston," in Vol. IV. — Ed.]

[1] [See Dr. Hale's chapter in this volume. — Ed.]

[2] [Of the *News-Letter*, see the account in Mr. Goddard's chapter in this volume; and regarding Cooper, see a note by the editor in Mr. Porter's chapter, also in the present volume. — Ed.]

Before the town had been finally purged, however, some of the bolder kept up a communication with their friends outside, by means of signals from the church steeples. "About three weeks ago," a letter-writer of July 25 says, "three fellows were taken out of one of the latter [steeples], who confess they had been so employed for seven days." The altercations between townsmen and soldiers had ceased; the town was under strict military discipline; and though the selectmen were not allowed to leave, it does not appear that there was any government except that administered by the General of the army. With his immediate command of fourteen thousand or so, inclusive of women and children attached to the soldiery, General Howe treated the place as a garrison, and gave great attention to the health of the troops; but the records show that he had a somewhat turbulent and unruly set of men to manage.[1] The large number of deserted houses, the destruction of others for fuel, the defenceless condition of the families of Patriots who had left the town,—all conspired to tempt plundering and depredation. In one case the wife of one of the privates, convicted of receiving stolen goods, was sentenced "to receive one hundred lashes on her bare back with a cat-o'-nine-tails, at the cart's tail, in different portions of the most conspicuous parts of the town, and to be imprisoned three months." The small-pox broke out both in the army and among the inhabitants, and was still ravaging the town when it was taken possession of by Washington, after the evacuation.

The evacuation itself was so suddenly determined on that for a few days the town was in a distracted condition, and the lawlessness which had been suppressed by the military arm broke out again almost unchecked. For ten days there was sleepless anxiety. The army was embarking and carrying away such stores as it could, destroying much that it must leave; plunder was going on on all sides, both with and without authority; and as the day drew nearer for the departure of the troops the excesses increased,[2] in spite of the following order from General Howe: —

"The commander-in-chief finding, notwithstanding former orders that have been given to forbid plundering, houses have been forced open and robbed, he is therefore under a necessity of declaring to the troops that the first soldier who is caught plundering will be hanged on the spot."

John Andrews, who was a very interested witness, gives a vivid account of his personal anxiety during the last hours of the British possession:[3] —

"By the earnest persuasion of your uncle's friends, and with the advice of the selectmen, I moved into his house at the time the troops, etc., were preparing for embarkation, under every difficulty you can conceive at such a time, as every day presented us with new scenes of the wantonness and destruction made by the soldiers.

[1] [This is apparent from the orders, and from the reiteration of them, with the constant threats of corporal punishment. See *Waller's Orderly-book.* — Ed.]

[2] [The British soldiers cut down several of the finest trees on the Mall, on the day of their evacuating the town. — Ed.]

[3] [*Mass. Hist. Soc. Proc.*, 1865, p. 409. — Ed.]

I had the care of six houses with their furniture, and as many stores filled with effects, for eleven months past; and, at a time like this, I underwent more fatigue and perplexity than I did through the whole siege; for I was obliged to take my rounds all day, without any cessation, and scarce ever failed of finding depredations made upon some one or other of them, that I was finally necessitated to procure men, at the extravagant rate of two dollars a day, to sleep in the several houses and stores for a fortnight before the military plunderers went off; for as sure as they were left alone one night, so sure they were plundered. Poor Ben, in addition to his other misfortunes, suffered in this: the fellow who took charge of his house neglected to sleep there the third night, being affrighted; the consequence was, a party of soldiers got in, went into his cellar, took liquors from thence, and had a revelling frolic in his parlor; carried off and destroyed his furniture, etc., to the value of two hundred pounds sterling, — which was not to be named with what fifty other houses suffered, or I may say a hundred. I was obliged to pay at the rate of a dollar an hour for hands to assist me in moving. Such was the demand for laborers that they were taken from me even at that, by the Tories, who bid over me, for the sake of carrying away *other people's* effects, wherever they could come at them, which so retarded my moving that I was obliged to leave my kitchen furniture in the house I left; consequently it was broken open and rummaged, and, with all my crockery, were carried off. Wat has stripped your uncle's house of everything he could conveniently carry off, which, had I known that had been his intention, I would by no means have consented to go into it; but as I had moved most of my heavy things while he was preparing to go, it was too late for me to get off when I discovered it. Your Uncle Jerry was almost frantic about it, and said he should write his brother, and acquaint him that I was knowing to it, and yet permitted him to do it; little thinking that it was not in my power to prevent his carrying off everything if he was disposed to do it, as I only took charge of the house as his (Wat's) substitute. He has left all the looking-glasses and window-curtains, with some tables and most of the chairs; only two bedsteads and one bed, without any bedding or sheets, or even a rag of linen of any kind. Some of the china, and principal part of the pewter, is the sum of what he has left, save the library, which was packed up corded to ship; but your Uncle Jerry and Mr. Austin went to him, and absolutely forbid it on his peril. He treated them in a very rough, cavalier way; told them they had no right to interfere with his business, — he should do as he pleased, and would not hear what they had to say. Upon the whole, I don't know but what it would have been as well if he had taken them, seeing matters are going to be carried with so high a hand."

Through all this family business and the confusion of narrative one may get a glimpse of the distractions and bitterness of the Tory hegira. "Nothing can be more diverting," says an amateur dramatist, "than to see the town in its present situation. All is uproar and confusion; carts, trucks, wheelbarrows, handbarrows, coaches, chaises, are driving as if the very devil was after them."[1] The return, piecemeal, of the clocks, chests of drawers, tables, and chairs, which then emigrated to the Provinces, continues to this day.

It is interesting to observe, as one of the first signs of the return of Boston to its independent life, that the Thursday Lecture was revived; and Dr. Eliot

[1] "The Blockheads," Act iii. Scene 3.

delivered the first as a thanksgiving discourse in the presence of His Excellency, General Washington. Shortly after, a town-meeting was held in the Old Brick Meeting-house, and officers for the year were chosen as usual. The town-meeting and the church were the spiritual Boston which asserted itself before commercial and trading Boston had revived. The town felt its insecurity. No one knew how soon the enemy might return with increased force and more strenuous measures, and it was only by degrees that the people returned and resumed their occupations. On April 19 the shops remained generally closed. "The town yet looks melancholy," writes Ezekiel Price in his diary, under that day; "but few of the inhabitants being removed back into it, occasioned by its not being sufficiently fortified and garrisoned against any further attempt of the enemy, to which it now lies much exposed." It is significant of the growing consciousness of the historic conflict, that he adds: "This day is the anniversary of the famous battle of Lexington." [1]

The Revolutionary War did not again make Boston a theatre of action; but the town was subjected to at least one panic.[2] It was not till the close of the period that the people saw anything of military pageant. Then they welcomed the entry of Rochambeau's forces after the battle of Yorktown, and the harbor was bright with the flags of the French fleet. The visit of these famous allies was the occasion of a general rejoicing. The war was over, and the people asked for no better opportunity for an outburst of hospitality. Sam Adams called a town-meeting, and with James Sullivan prepared an address from Boston to Baron Vioménil, the chief officer; Rochambeau himself having embarked elsewhere.[3] But during the period

[1] Diary of Ezekiel Price in *Mass. Hist. Soc. Proc.*, November, 1863.

[2] Mrs. John Adams, writing to her husband under date of Aug. 5, 1777, says: "If alarming half-a-dozen places at the same time is an act of generalship, Howe may boast of his late conduct. We have never, since the evacuation of Boston, been under apprehensions of an invasion equal to what we suffered last week. All Boston was in confusion, packing up and carting out of town household furniture, military stores, goods, etc. Not less than a thousand teams were employed on Friday and Saturday; and, to their shame be it told, not a small trunk would they carry under eight dollars, and many of them, I am told, asked a hundred dollars a load; for carting a hogshead of molasses eight miles, thirty dollars. O human nature! or, rather, O inhuman nature! what art thou? The report of the fleet's being seen off Cape Ann, Friday night, gave me the alarm, and, though pretty weak, I set about packing up my things, and on Saturday removed a load."— *Familiar Letters of John Adams, and his wife Abigail Adams, during the Revolution*, p. 287.

[Three years later there was another period of suspense. In 1780, Arthur Lee writes from Paris to the committee of foreign correspondence: "February 3. An expedition, with ten thousand of the enemy's best troops, will take place in about two months, from Ireland. Altho' from the profound secrecy observed I have not yet been able to discover its destination with certainty, yet I have sufficient reason to think that Boston is the object of it."— ED.]

[3] [The artillery were the earliest to reach Boston, arriving on November 18. Rochambeau, who had accompanied the army to Providence, here transferred the command of it to the Baron de Vioménil, and returned to the Chesapeake and embarked. The main body of the army reached Boston on December 3, 4, and 5, being favored with fair weather. On the twenty-third Vioménil went on board the "Triomphant," and on the twenty-fourth the whole squadron, ten sail in all, mounting seven hundred and fifty-eight guns and carrying four thousand men, put to sea. (*Mag. of Amer. Hist.*, July, 1881.) The address of the citizens of Boston to Vioménil, adopted at a meeting held December [illegible], and his reply, are reprinted in *Mag. of Amer. Hist.*, July, 1881, p. 32, from the *Pennsylvania Packet*, Jan. 8, 1783. See also an account of these proceedings in Drake's *Landmarks of Boston*, 433.— ED.]

from 1776 to 1783 there were occasional visits from French vessels, and the reports made by Frenchmen who received the hospitality of the town give a hint of the social life of the period. The Frenchmen themselves were objects of great curiosity. Mr. Breck says in his entertaining *Recollections* : —

"Before the Revolution the colonists had little or no communication with France, so that Frenchmen were known to them only through the prejudiced medium of England. Every vulgar story told by John Bull about Frenchmen living on salad and frogs was implicitly believed by Brother Jonathan, even by men of education and the first standing in society. When, therefore, the first French squadron arrived at Boston [in 1778], the whole town, most of whom had never seen a Frenchman, ran to the wharves to catch a peep at the gaunt, half-starved, *soup-maigre* crews.



AUTOGRAPHS OF FRENCH OFFICERS.

How much were my good townsmen astonished when they beheld plump, portly officers and strong, vigorous sailors! They could scarcely credit the thing, apparent as it was. Did these hearty-looking people belong to the lantern-jawed, spindle-shank race of *mounseers?* In a little while they became convinced that they had been deceived as to their personal appearance; but they knew, notwithstanding their good looks, that they were no better than frog-eaters, because they had been discovered hunting them in the noted Frog-pond at the bottom of the Common. With this notion in his head, Mr. Nathaniel Tracy, who lived in a beautiful villa at Cambridge,[1] made a great feast for the admiral, Count D'Estaing, and his officers. Everything was furnished that could be had in the country to ornament and give variety to the entertainment. My father was one of the guests, and told me often after that two large tureens of soup were placed at the ends of the table. The admiral sat on the right of Tracy, and Monsieur de l'Etombe on the left. L'Etombe was consul of France, resident at Boston. Tracy filled a plate with soup which went to the admiral, and the next was handed to the consul. As soon as L'Etombe put his spoon into his plate he fished up a large frog, just as green and perfect as if he had hopped from the pond into

[1] [The Cragie or Longfellow house. — Ed.]

the tureen. Not knowing at first what it was, he seized it by one of its hind legs, and, holding it up in view of the whole company, discovered that it was a full grown frog. As soon as he had thoroughly inspected it, and made himself sure of the matter, he exclaimed: 'Ah! mon Dieu! une grenouille!' then, turning to the gentleman next to him, gave him the frog. He received it and passed it round the table. Thus the poor *crapaud* made the tour from hand to hand until it reached the admiral. The company, convulsed with laughter, examined the soup plates as the servants brought them, and in each was to be found a frog. The uproar was universal. Meantime Tracy kept his ladle going, wondering what his outlandish guests meant by such extravagant merriment. 'What 's the matter?' asked he, and, raising his head, surveyed the frogs dangling by a leg in all directions. 'Why don't they eat them?' he exclaimed. 'If they knew the confounded trouble I had to catch them, in order to treat them to a dish of their own country, they would find that, with me at least, it was no joking matter.' Thus was poor Tracy deceived by vulgar prejudice and common report. He meant to regale his distinguished guests with refined hospitality, and had caused all the swamps of Cambridge to be searched, in order to furnish them with a generous supply of what he believed to be, in France, a standing national dish." [1]

Mr. Breck's father was agent for the French, and is the "Mr. Brick" whose name occurs so often in that part of the Marquis de Chastellux's *Travels in North America* which relates to Boston. This traveller, who was an officer in the French army, reached Boston during the stay there of Baron de Vioménil; and his record, while it gives little description of the town, intimates that the hospitality extended to the French was unremitting. He had scarcely arrived in town before he was hurried off to the Association ball, where he took notice of the general awkwardness of the Boston dancers. The ladies he thought well dressed, but with less elegance and refinement than those whom he had met at Philadelphia. His visit was filled with a series of calls and entertainments; and among them he notes a club: —

"This assembly is held every Tuesday, in rotation, at the houses of the different members who compose it; this was the day for Mr. Russell, an honest merchant, who gave us an excellent reception. The laws of the club are not straitening, the number of dishes for supper alone are limited, and there must be only two of meat, — for supper is not the American repast. Vegetables, pies, and especially good wine, are not spared. The hour of assembling is after tea, when the company play at cards, converse, and read the public papers; and sit down to table between nine and ten. The supper was as free as if there had been no strangers. Songs were given at table, and a Mr. Stewart sung some which were very gay, with a tolerable good voice."

A little further on he says: —

"They made me play at whist, for the first time since my arrival in America. The cards were English, that is, much handsomer and dearer than ours; and we marked our points with louis-d'ors, or six-and-thirties. When the party was finished, the loss

[1] *Recollections of Samuel Breck, with passages from his note-book*, pp. 24–27.

was not difficult to settle; for the company was still faithful to that voluntary law established in society from the commencement of the troubles, which prohibited playing for money during the war. The inhabitants of Boston are fond of high play, and it is fortunate perhaps that the war happened when it did, to moderate this passion, which began to be attended with dangerous consequences."

Political clubs had long been active in Boston, and social clubs were now springing up. From 1777 dates the Wednesday Evening Club, which has maintained ever since an unbroken succession.[1]

Another French traveller, the Abbé Robin, who preceded Chastellux, has left an account of Boston in 1781, which deals more with the external features of the town: —

"The inside of the town does not at all lessen the idea that is formed by an exterior prospect. A superb wharf has been carried out above two thousand feet into the sea, and is broad enough for stores and workshops through the whole of its extent; it communicates at right angles with the principal street of the town, which is both large and spacious, and bends in a curve parallel to the harbor. This street is ornamented with elegant buildings, for the most part two or three stories high, and many other streets terminate in this, communicating with it on each side. The form and construction of the houses would surprise an European eye; they are built of brick and wood, not in the clumsy and melancholy taste of our ancient European towns, but regularly, and well provided with windows and doors. The wooden work, or frame, is light, covered on the outside with thin boards, well planed, and lapped over each other as we do tiles on our roofs in France. These buildings are generally painted with a pale white color, which renders the prospect much more pleasing than it would otherwise be; the roofs are set off with balconies, doubtless for the more ready extinguishing of fire; the whole is supported by a wall of about a foot high; it is easy to see how great an advantage these houses have over ours in point of neatness and salubrity. All the parts of these buildings are so well joined, and their weight is so equally divided and proportionate to their bulk, that they may be removed from place to place with little difficulty. I have seen one of two stories high removed above a quarter of a mile, if not more, from its original situation; and the whole French army have seen the same thing done at Newport. What they tell us of the travelling habitations of the Scythians is far less wonderful. Their household furniture is simple, but made of choice wood, after the English fashion, which renders its appearance less gay; their floors are covered with handsome carpets, or printed cloths, but others sprinkle them with fine sand.

"This city is supposed to contain about six thousand houses, and thirty thousand inhabitants;[2] there are nineteen churches for the several sects here, all of them convenient, and several finished with taste and elegance, especially those of the Presbyterians and the Church of England; their form is generally a long square, ornamented with a pulpit, and furnished with pews of a similar fabrication throughout. The poor

[1] [*The Centennial Celebration of the Wednesday Evening Club, Instituted June* 21, 1777, *Boston*, 1878, gives the story of its career. — Ed.]

[2] The Abbé's arithmetic is as wild as some of his generalizing. In 1789 there were, by actual count, two thousand six hundred and thirty-nine dwelling-houses, stores, and public buildings, exclusive of distilleries, sugar-houses, rope-walks, mechanics' shops, and stables. (See 2 *Mass. Hist. Coll.*, ix. 204–222.) The population in 1783 did not exceed eighteen thousand, and remained stationary for several years.

as well as the rich hear the word of God in these places, in a convenient and decent posture of body. Sunday is observed with the utmost strictness; all business, how important soever, is then totally at a stand, and the most innocent recreations and pleasures prohibited.[1] Boston, that populous town, where at other times there is such a hurry of business, is on this day a mere desert; you may walk the streets without meeting a single person, or if by chance you meet one, you scarcely dare to stop and talk with him. A Frenchman that lodged with me took it into his head to play on the flute on Sundays for his amusement; the people upon hearing it were greatly enraged, collected in crowds round the house, and would have carried matters to extremity in a short time with the musician, had not the landlord given him warning of his danger, and forced him to desist.[2] Upon this day of melancholy you cannot go into a house but you find the whole family employed in reading the Bible; and indeed it is an affecting sight to see the father of a family surrounded by his household, hearing him explain the sublime truths of this sacred volume. Nobody fails here of going to the place of worship appropriated to his sect. In these places there reigns a profound silence; an order and respect is also observable which has not been seen for a long time in our Catholic churches. Their psalmody is grave and majestic; and the harmony of the poetry, in their national tongue, adds a grace to the music, and contributes greatly toward keeping up the attention of the worshippers. . . .

"Piety is not the only motive that brings the American ladies in crowds to the various places of worship. Deprived of all shows and public diversions whatever, the church is the grand theatre where they attend to display their extravagance and finery. There they come dressed off in the finest silks, and overshadowed with a profusion of the most superb plumes. The hair of the head is raised and supported upon cushions to an extravagant height, somewhat resembling the manner in which the French ladies wore their hair some years ago. Instead of powdering, they often wash the head, which answers the purpose well enough, as their hair is commonly of an agreeable light color; but the more fashionable among them begin now to adopt the present European method of setting off the head to the best advantage. They are of a large size, well proportioned, their features generally regular, and their complexion fair, without ruddiness. They have less cheerfulness and ease of behavior than the ladies of France, but more of greatness and dignity. I have even imagined that I have seen something in them that answers to the idea of beauty we gain from those master-pieces of the artists of antiquity, which are yet extant in our days.

[1] [Mr. Charles Deane points out to the Editor some satirical lines on the "Boston Sabbath," printed in the *Newport News-Letter*, May 19, 1761, of which a few are: —

"Six days, said He (and loud the same expressed),
Shall men still labour; on the seventh rest:
But here, alas! in this great pious Town,
They annul his law, and thus prefer their own.

Five days and half shall men, and women too,
Attend their business and their mirth pursue.
One day and half 'tis requisite to rest
From toilsome labour and a luscious feast."

The beginning of Sunday observance on Saturday at sunset has obtained in New England country towns down to a recent day, if indeed this custom is yet wholly disused. — Ed.]

[2] [It is pertinent to consider that perhaps no small part of this aversion arose from the commingling, in the common mind, of Papist and Frenchman. The time had not far gone by when, under the stress of the French and Indian wars, no foreigner could sojourn in Boston without being a suspected French spy; and if a Frenchman, a Papist. There were those still living who could remember when Governor Belcher issued the warrant, March 17, 1731, now preserved in the Charity Building, directing the sheriff of Suffolk to search for Papists who joined with their priest speedily designed to celebrate mass; and, if need be, to break open any dwelling-house, etc. Accompanying this warrant is a list of such Papists in Boston, largely men-servants, etc. — Ed.]

The stature of the men is tall, and their carriage erect, but their make is rather slim, and their color inclining to pale; they are not so curious in their dress as the women, but everything upon them is neat and proper. At twenty-five years of age the women begin to lose the bloom and freshness of youth; and at thirty-five or forty, their beauty is gone. The decay of the men is equally premature; and I am inclined to think that life itself is here proportionably short. I visited all the burying-grounds in Boston, where it is usual to inscribe upon the stone over each grave the name and age of the deceased, and found that few who had arrived to a state of manhood ever advanced beyond their fiftieth year; fewer still to seventy; and beyond that scarcely any."

The picture of Boston given by the French travellers of this time, as indeed most of the representations of America then from the same sources, have an air of insincerity about them, as if written by men preoccupied with notions as to the virginal character of American nature and society. The people of Boston themselves were, during the progress of the war and immediately afterward, in a restless, semi-violent condition, demoralized by the sudden changes of fortune which befell merchants, and by the inequalities of life resultant upon war and disturbed relations. Sam Adams, always a democrat in principle and a *doctrinaire* in poverty, was indignant at the display of wealth made by Hancock and others. He frowned upon the increasing extravagance and levity of the town;[1] and he resorted to his favorite method of holding public meetings in rebuke of the temper, but with little avail. Minot the historian gives, in a few words, the general character of the change at work in society: —

"The usual consequences of war were conspicuous upon the habits of the people of Massachusetts. Those of the maritime towns relapsed into the voluptuousness which arises from the precarious wealth of naval adventurers. An emulation prevailed among men of fortune to exceed each other in the full display of their riches. This was imitated among the less opulent classes of citizens, and drew them off from those principles of diligence and economy which constitute the best support of all governments, and particularly of the republican. Besides which, what was most to be lamented, the discipline and manners of the army had vitiated the taste and relaxed the industry of the yeomen. In this disposition of the people to indulge the use of luxuries, and in the exhausted state of the country, the merchants saw a market for foreign manufactures. The political character of America, standing in a respectable view abroad, gave a confidence and credit to individuals heretofore unknown. This credit was improved, and goods were imported to a much greater amount than could be consumed and paid for."[2]

The most conspicuous person in this display of wealth and state was undoubtedly John Hancock, — a good-natured, vain man, with excellent qualities which his contemporaries perceived, but which have been obscured by his inordinate conceit and love of extreme distinction. John Adams observed with satisfaction Hancock's chagrin at finding himself subordinated to the Virginian, Washington, at the beginning of the contest, when Han-

[1] See Wells, *Life of Samuel Adams*, iii. 157–159. [2] *Insurrections in Massachusetts*, p. 12.

cock's reputation was quite as general as Washington's; but he lets us also see the sincere good-nature and fundamental humility with which he bore his lesser rank. Among his own townsmen the rich Bostonian dearly loved to make himself of importance. "King Hancock" was the sobriquet which he earned, and he was a constant butt for Tory wits.[1] In the *Pennsylvania Ledger* for March 11, 1778, "a gentleman from the eastward" says: —

"John Hancock of Boston appears in public with all the pageantry and state of an Oriental prince; he rides in an elegant chariot, which was taken in a prize to the 'Civil Usage' pirate vessel, and by the owners presented to him. He is attended by four servants dressed in superb livery, mounted on fine horses richly caparisoned; and escorted by fifty horsemen with drawn sabres, the one-half of whom precede and the other follow his carriage."[2]

A good observer writes in 1780: —

"Boston affords nothing new but complaints upon complaints. I have been credibly informed that a person who used to live well has been obliged to take the feathers out of his bed and sell them to an upholsterer to get money to buy bread. Many doubtless are exceedingly distressed; and yet, such is the infatuation of the day, that the rich, regardless of the necessities of the poor, are more luxurious and extravagant than formerly.[3] Boston exceeds even Tyre; for not only are her merchants princes, but even her tavern-keepers are gentlemen. May it not be more tolerable for Tyre than for her! There can be no surer sign of a decay of morals than the tavern-keepers growing rich fast."[4]

We have but scanty personal recollections preserved of this period relating to the common life within the town, and must have recourse again to the good-natured Mr. Breck, who piques us by forgetting more important things than he remembered. His childhood was spent in Boston; and he remembered well the old beacon which stood on the hill, and was blown down in 1789: —

"Spokes were fixed in a large mast, on the top of which was placed a barrel of pitch or tar, always ready to be fired on the approach of the enemy. Around this pole I have fought many battles, as a South End boy,[5] against the boys of the North End of the town; and bloody ones, too, with slings and stones very skilfully and earnestly used. In what a state of semi-barbarism did the rising generations of those days exist! From time immemorial these hostilities were carried on by the juvenile part of the community. The school-masters whipt, parents scolded, — nothing could check it. Was it a remnant of the pugilistic propensities of our British ancestors; or was it an untamed feeling arising from our sequestered and colonial situation? Whatever was the cause, every-

[1] [See further on Hancock in Mr. Porter's and Mr. Lodge's chapters. — Ed.]

[2] Moore's *Diary of the American Revolution*, ii. 11, 12. The "gentleman from the eastward" appears to have been the ancestor of the similar character who, during the late war, was always coming away from the front.

[3] [It is said that Hancock issued his invitations to a ball given by him at Concert Hall, in November, 1780, printed on the back of playing-cards, — showing scarcity in other things than the necessaries of life. — Ed.]

[4] Hazard to Belknap, 5 *Mass. Hist. Coll.*, ii. 47.

[5] Mr. Breck's house was on Tremont Street, at the corner of Winter Street; and this shows how local appellations have changed.

thing of the kind ceased with the termination of our Revolutionary War. . . . I forget on what holiday it was that the Anticks, another exploded remnant of colonial manners, used to perambulate the town. They have ceased to do it now; but I remember them as late as 1782. They were a set of the lowest blackguards, who, disguised in filthy clothes and ofttimes with masked faces, went from house to house in large companies; and, *bon gré, mal gré*, obtruding themselves everywhere, particularly into the rooms that were occupied by parties of ladies and gentlemen, would demean themselves with great insolence. I have seen them at my father's, when his assembled friends were at cards, take possession of a table, seat themselves on rich furniture, and proceed to handle the cards, to the great annoyance of the company. The only way to get rid of them was to give them money, and listen patiently to a foolish dialogue between two or more of them. One of them would cry out: —

"'Ladies and gentlemen sitting by the fire,
Put your hands in your pockets and give us our desire.'

When this was done, and they had received some money, a kind of acting took place. One fellow was knocked down and lay sprawling on the carpet, while another bellowed out: —

"'See, there he lies!
But ere he dies,
A doctor must be had.'

He calls for a doctor, who soon appears, and enacts the part so well that the wounded man revives. In this way they would continue for half an hour; and it happened not unfrequently that the house would be filled by another gang when these had departed. There was no refusing admittance. Custom had licensed these vagabonds to enter even by force any place they chose. What should we say to such intruders now? Our manners would not brook such usage a moment. Undoubtedly these plays were a remnant of the old mysteries of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries.[1]

"Connected with this subject and period may be mentioned the inhuman and revolting custom of punishing criminals in the open street. The large whipping-post, painted red, stood conspicuously and permanently in the most public street in town. It was placed in State Street,[2] directly under the windows of a great writing-school which I frequented, and from them the scholars were indulged in the spectacle of all kinds of punishment, suited to harden their hearts and brutalize their feelings. Here

[1] Since the publication of Breck's *Recollections* a correspondent has called the Editor's attention to the probable origin of this horse-play. In Hervey's *Book of Christmas*, a Cornwall mystery is given by Mr. Sandys as "still performed in Cornwall;" at the date, that is, of 1786. In this *Mystery* several characters, as the Turkish Knight, the King of Egypt, St. George, the Dragon, Father Christmas, and others, enter by turn. When Father Christmas enters, he says:

"Here come I, old Father Christmas!
Welcome, or welcome not;
I hope old Father Christmas
Will never be forgot.
I come not here to laugh or jeer,
But for a pocketful of money and a skiuful of beer."

St. George and the Dragon fight, and the latter is killed. Father Christmas calls out:

"Is there a doctor to be found,
All ready near at hand,
To cure a deep and deadly wound,
And make the champion stand?"

The doctor appears, performs his cure, the fight is renewed, and the dragon again killed.

The scraps of this performance, as given by Mr. Breck, do seem to be a reminiscence of this West-of-England Mystery; and it appears as if some of the townspeople from that section had brought with them a rude sport which died out in the more active, stirring life of the town.

[1] [The whipping-post was later removed to Tremont Street, near the West Street gate.—ED.]

women were taken from a huge cage in which they were dragged on wheels from prison, and tied to the post, with bare backs, on which thirty or forty lashes were bestowed, amid the screams of the culprits and the uproar of the mob. A little farther in the street was to be seen the pillory, with three or four fellows fastened by the head and hands, and standing for an hour in that helpless posture, exposed to gross and cruel insult from the multitude, who pelted them incessantly with rotten eggs and every repulsive kind of garbage that could be collected. These things I have often witnessed; but they have given way to better systems, better manners, and better feelings." [1]

We have had occasion more than once to speak of the town-meeting as an exponent of Boston ideas. A single passage from Breck's *Recollections* will suffice as an illustration of the same institution when taken as an exponent of the manners of the town. When Lafayette was in Boston in 1784,[2] he received a good many attentions from the Breck family.

"Anxious to show him all that related to our institutions and manners, my father invited him one day to go to Faneuil Hall to hear the discussion of some municipal law then in agitation. 'You will see,' said he, 'the quiet proceedings of our townsmen, and learn by a personal examination how erroneous is the general opinion abroad that a large community cannot be governed by a pure democracy: Here we have in Boston,' continued he, 'about eighteen thousand inhabitants, and all our town business

[1] *Recollections of Samuel Breck*, pp. 33–37.

[2] [Lafayette was not personally unknown in Boston; he had been here more than once before. It will be remembered that after the failure of the Rhode Island campaign, in 1778, he had come to Boston to use his persuasion with the commander of the French fleet not to desert the cause. After Yorktown, when he hastened to France to carry despatches to the French king, as well as from tenderer impulses, he had come to Boston to embark, reaching here on Dec. 10, 1781. Here he had been enthusiastically received; a committee of the town, of which Samuel Adams was chairman, had presented an address to him; and a subscription taking place to rebuild the Charlestown meeting-house, burned during the battle on Bunker Hill, Lafayette had placed his name on the list for twenty-five guineas. The officers of the Massachusetts Line also presented an address. He sailed, December 23, in the French frigate "L'Alliance." It was Aug. 4, 1784, when Lafayette again landed in New York; and after first visiting Mount Vernon, he began that triumphal progress through the country which evinced the love the people bore for him. As he approached Boston, in October, the officers of the army met him at Watertown; then in a procession he made his entry over Boston Neck, through throngs of people, while he was conducted to a tavern, where he returned their compliments in a speech from a balcony. In the evening the street lanterns were lighted for the first time since the peace. On the nineteenth, the anniversary of Yorktown, Governor Hancock received him formally. Five hundred gentlemen dined with



their guest in Faneuil Hall. Thirteen decorated arches surrounded the room, and Lafayette sat under a huge *fleur-de-lis*. Thirteen guns in the market-place accompanied as many patriotic toasts. When that one proposing the health of Washington was drunk, a curtain fell and disclosed a picture of the General, crowned with laurel, and wearing the color of America and France. Lafayette led off the response with "Vive Washington!" In the evening, Madam Haley, a sister of the notorious John Wilkes (see Vol. II. p. xliv), and a leader of fashion in the town, gave a great party, and there were many illuminations throughout the streets. Some days later, after he had made excursions along the coast, he embarked in the French frigate "La Nymphe," and sailed for Virginia. *Magazine of American History*, December, 1878. — Ed.]

is done in a general assembly of the people.' The Marquis, glad of the opportunity, consented to attend my father. By and by the great bell of the celebrated Doctor Samuel Cooper's church, with a dozen others, called the inhabitants together. I forget what the business was, but it inspired universal interest, and drew to the hall an overflowing house. The Marquis was of course well accommodated, and sat in silent admiration at the demure manner in which the moderator was chosen and inducted to the chair, and the meeting fully organized. Then the debate opened. One speaker affirmed, another denied, a third rejoined; each increasing in vehemence, until the matter in debate was changed into personal sarcasm. Gibe followed gibe, commotion ensued, the popular mass rolled to and fro, disorder reached its height, and the elders of the town were glad to break up the stormy meeting, and postpone the discussion. My father led the Marquis out in the midst of the angry multitude. When fairly disengaged from the crowd he said to the illustrious stranger: 'This is not the sample which I wished to show you of our mode of deliberating. Never do I recollect to have seen such fiery spirits assembled in this hall, and I must beg you not to judge of us by what you have seen to-day; for good sense, moderation, and perfect order are the usual characteristics of my fellow-townsmen, here and elsewhere.' 'No doubt, no doubt,' said the Marquis laughing; 'but it is well enough to know that there are exceptions to the general rule,' or words to that effect, — meaning to make a joke of the matter, which was, indeed, very often afterward the occasion of mirthful remarks upon the forbearance, calmness, decorum, and parliamentary politeness ever to be found in deliberative assemblies of pure democracy." [2]

BOSTON March 29, 1783.

Laſt night Colonel John Trumbull arrived in this town; and brought with him the following very important

INTELLIGENCE,

viz.

Philadelphia, 23d March, 1783.

Half paſt Six o'Clock.

Dear SIR,

TEN minutes ſince, the Captain of the Hyder Aly came to Mr. Morris's, where I dined, with an account of a French packet being arrived at Cheſter, in Thirty days from Cadiz, with the news that a

GENERAL PEACE

was ſigned the Twentieth of January; and that Hoſtilities were to ceaſe, on this coaſt, the 20th of this month.

Juſt now a meſſenger arrived from Monſieur Vallogne, to the Miniſter, with the ſame news: and that the Captain of the packet was on the road with the diſpatches.

God bleſs you! Your's,

J. CARTER.

J. Wadſworth, Eſq.

PEACE EXTRA.[1]

Perhaps, if Mr. Breck had been philosophically disposed, he might have reminded his guest that the town-meeting offered an opportunity for the escape of feeling, and was thus a safety-valve. The newspaper had not yet taken the place of the public assembly as the clearest reflection of the life of the day.

N. E. Sanders

[1] [This reduction of the Extra announcing the conclusion of a general peace is made from an original owned by Colonel W. W. Clapp. The general celebration came later. William Burbeck rendered his bill, Feb. 28, 1784, to the State for building a stage to exhibit the fireworks for celebrating the peace, amounting to £16 17s. 3d. — ED.]

[2] *Recollections of Samuel Breck*, pp. 39, 40.

SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES BY THE EDITOR.

THE LOYALISTS. — Sabine, in his *American Loyalists*, estimates that some two thousand adherents of the King left Massachusetts. It is also stated that of the three hundred and ten who were banished by the State, over sixty were Harvard graduates. John Adams was inclined to believe that in the Colonies at large not more than two-thirds were against the Crown, and some of the Colonies were about equally divided. "The last contest in the town of Boston, in 1775, between Whig and Tory, was decided by five against two."—*Works*, x. 63, 87. Without aiming to make it complete, we offer the following list of such of the Loyalists as may claim, either as inhabitants or by official residence or association, to have some connection with Boston. In making it we have used, besides Sabine, the list of the proscribed in 1778, as given in Vol. II. 563; the "list of the inhabitants of Boston who on the evacuation by the British removed to Halifax with the army," which is printed in the *Mass. Hist. Soc. Proc.*, Dec. 1880, p. 266 (see also *Curwen's Journal*, p. 485); the address to Hutchinson and its signers, June 1, 1774, given in the *Mass. Hist. Soc. Proc.*, Feb. 1871, p. 43, and on p. 45, the "Solemn League and Covenant," reported by Warren on the fifth of June, and sent out to the towns as a circular, which occasioned a "protest" and a "proclamation" from Gage, likewise printed in the same place.

The names of the "protesters" against the "Solemn League and Covenant," and of the addressers of Hutchinson in 1774, are printed in *Mass. Hist. Soc. Proc.*, Oct. 1870, p. 392. The signers to the address to Hutchinson in 1774 is also in *Curwen's Journal*, p. 465. The two volumes marked "Royalists," in the *Mass. Archives* (vol. i. 1775–84, and ii. 1778–84) have also been examined. They are made up very largely of returns from town committees to the Provincial Congress, respecting suspected persons, confiscated estates, with the accounts of the agents of such estates, the doings of the Committee of Sequestration, conveyances of the property, etc. In the first volume, pp. 333 and 338, is the return June 13, 1782, of the Committee on Confiscated Estates in Suffolk County, showing whose estates were settled by an agent of the Province, and to whom the different lots and buildings were sold, and for what sum; the whole amounting to £32,062 8*s.* 2*d.* Numerous papers relating to absentee's estates, 1782–89, are in *Mass. Archives*, cxxxix. and beginning p. 470, are the bonds of persons "supposed to be royalists." The confiscation acts of Massachusetts are printed in *Curwen's Journal*, p. 475, and the banishment act of 1778, in Ibid. p. 479. The *Journals and Letters of Samuel Curwen* give the best account of life among the Loyalists in England, and numerous notices of Loyalists are appended to it, as edited by George A. Ward, Boston, 1864. A New England club of Loyalists was formed in London in 1776, consisting of the following: — Thomas Hutchinson, Richard Clark, Joseph Green, Jonathan Bliss, Jonathan Sewall, Joseph Waldo, S. S. Blowers, Elisha Hutchinson, William Hutchinson, Samuel Sewall, Samuel Quincy, Isaac Smith, Harrison Gray, David Greene, Jonathan Clark, Thomas Flucker, Joseph Taylor, Daniel Silsbee, Thomas Brinley, William Cabot, John S. Copley, Nathaniel Coffin, Samuel Porter, Benjamin Pickman, John Amory, Robert Auchmuty, Major Urquhart, Samuel Curwen, Edward Oxnard,— most of whom were associated with Boston.

Dr. John C. Warren, in 1800, speaks of the visits he paid in England to the Tories, Harrison Gray, the Vassalls, and others, who were then living there "very comfortably." *Life of John Collins Warren*, i 48.

The enumeration below is confined in the main to heads of families: —

Acre, Thomas
Allen, Ebenezer
Allen, Jeremiah
Allen, Jolley[1]
Amory, John
Amory, Thomas[2]
Anderson, James[3]
Andros, Barret
Apthorp, Rev. East[4]
Apthorp, Thomas[5]
Apthorp, William[6]
Asby, James
Ashley, Joseph
Atkins, Gibbs[7]
Atkinson, John, *Merch.*
Auchmuty, Robert[8]
Auhard, Benjamin
Aylwin, Thomas
Ayres, Eleanor
Badger, Rev. Moses[9]
Baker, John, Jr.
Barclay, Andrew
Barnard, John
Barrell, Colburn
Barrell, Walter, *In. Gen.*
Barrick, James, *Cl. Ins.*
Barton, David
Beath, Mary
Bernard, Sir Francis[10]
Berry, Edward
Berry, John
Bethel, Robert, *Cl. Col.*
Bethune, George[11]
Black, David
Black, John
Black, William
Blair, John, *Baker*
Blair, Robert
Blair, William
Blowers, Sams'n Salter[12]
Borland, John[13]
Borland, John Lindall[14]
Bouman, Archibald
Boutineau, James[15]
Bowen, John
Bowers, Archibald
Bowes, William, *Mer.*[16]
Bowles, William
Bowman, Arch'ld, *Auc.*
Boylston, John[17]
Boylston, Thomas[18]
Boylston, Ward Nich's[19]
Bradstreet, Samuel
Brandon, John
Brattle, Maj. Thomas[20]
Brattle, William
Bridgham, Ebenezer
Brinley, George[21]

Brinley, Thomas, *Mer.*[22]
Broderick, John
Brown, David
Brown, Thomas, *Mer.*
Bruce, James[23]
Bryant, John
Brymer, Alexander
Bulfinch, Samuel
Burch, William[24]
Burroughs, John
Burton, Mary, *Milliner*
Burton, William
Butler, Gillam
Butler, James
Butter, James
Byles, Rev. Dr. Mather[25]
Byles, Mather, Jr.[26]
Calef, Robert[27]
Campbel, William
Caner, Rev. Dr. Henry[28]
Capen, Hopestill
Carr, Mrs.
Carver, Melzer[29]
Cary, Nathaniel
Case, James
Caste, Dennis
Caste, Dr. Thomas
Cazneau, And'w. *Law.*[30]
Cazneau, Edward[31]
Cazneau, William
Cednor, William
Ceely, John
Chadwel, Samuel
Chandler, John, Esq.[32]
Chandler, Nathaniel
Chandler, Rufus, *Law.*
Chandler, William
Cheever, Wm. Downe
Chipman, Ward[33]
Church, Dr. Benjamin[34]
Clark, Benjamin
Clark, John
Clark, Joseph
Clarke, Isaac Winslow
Clarke, Jonathan[35]
Clarke, Richard[36]
Clemmens, Thomas
Clement, Capt. Joseph
Clementson, Samuel
Codner, William
Coffin, Ebenezer[37]
Coffin, John[38]
Coffin, Nathaniel
Coffin, Nathaniel[39]
Coffin, Nathaniel, Jr.
Coffin, Sir Thos. Aston[40]
Coffin, William[41]
Coffin, Wm. Jr. *Merch.*
Colepepper, James
Connor, Mrs.
Cook, Robert
Cooley, John
Copley, John Singleton[42]
Cotton, John[43]
Courtney, James
Courtney, Richard
Courtney, Thomas
Cox, Edward
Cox, Lemuel
Crane, Timothy
Crow, Charles[44]
Cummins, A. and E.
Cunningham, Archib'd[45]
Cushman, Elkanah
Cutler, Ebenezer[46]
Danforth, Dr. Sam'l[47]
Danforth, Thomas[48]
Davies, William
Davis, Benjamin
Davis, Edward
Deblois, Gilbert[49]
De Blois, Lewis[50]
Dechezzan, Adam[51]
Demsey, Roger
Dickenson, Nathaniel
Dickinson, Francis
Dickinson, William
Dickson, William
Domette, Joseph
Dougherty, Edward
Doyley, Francis
Doyley, John
Draper, Margaret[52]
Draper, Richard[53]
Dudley, Charles, *Collector, Newport.*
Duelly, William
Dumaresq, Philip, *Mer.*[54]
Duncan, Alexander
Dunlap, Daniel
Duyer, Edmund
Edson, Josiah
Elton, Peter
Emerson, John
Erving, George[55]
Erving, John[56]
Erving, John, Jr.[57]
Fall, Thomas
Faneuil, Benjamin[58]
Faneuil, Benjamin, Jr.
Field, John
Fillis, John
Fisher, Turner[59]
Fisher, Wilfred
Fitch, Samuel
Fleming, John[60]
Flucker, Thomas[61]
Forrest, James[62]
Foster, Edward
Foster, Edward, Jr.
Frankland, Lady[63]
Fullerton, Stephen
Gamage, James
Gardiner, Dr. Sylvester[64]
Gay, Martin[65]
Gay, Samuel[66]
Gemmill, Matthew
Geyer, Fred'k William[67]
Goddard, Lemuel
Goldthwait, Ezekiel
Goldthwait, Joseph[68]
Goldthwait, M. B.
Gookin, Edmund
Gore, John[69]
Gore, Samuel
Gorman, Edward
Gray, Andrew
Gray, Harrison[70]
Gray, Harrison, Jr.
Gray, John[71]
Gray, Joseph[72]
Gray, Lewis
Gray, Samuel[73]
Gray, Thomas
Greecart, John
Greene, Benjamin[74]
Greene, David[75]
Greene, Richard[76]
Green, Francis[77]
Green, Hammond
Green, Joseph[78]
Greenlaw, John
Greenleaf, Stephen[79]
Greenwood, Isaac
Greenwood, Nathaniel
Greenwood, Samuel
Gridley, Benjamin[80]
Grison, Edmond
Grozart, John
Hale, Samuel
Hall, James[81]
Hallowell, Benjamin[82]
Hallowell, Robert[83]
Halson, Henry
Harper, Isaac
Harrison, Joseph[84]
Harrison, Richard A.[85]
Haskins, John
Hatch, Christopher
Hatch, Hawes
Hatch, Nathaniel[86]
Heath, William
Henderson, James
Hester, John
Hewes, Shubael[87]
Hicks, John[88]
Hinston, John
Hirons, Richard
Hodges, Samuel
Hodgson, John
Hodson, Thomas
Holmes, Benjamin M.
Homans, John
Hooper, Jacob
Howe, John[89]
Hubbard, Daniel
Hughes, Peter
Hughes, Samuel
Hulton, Henry
Hunt, John
Hunter, William
Hurlston, Richard
Hutchinson, Eliakim[90]
Hutchinson, Elisha[91]
Hutchinson, Foster[92]
Hutchinson, Gov. Thos.[93]
Hutchinson, Thos. Jr.[94]
Hutchinson, William
Inman, John
Inman, Ralph[95]
Jackson, William[96]
Jarvis, Robert
Jeffrey, Patrick[97]
Jeffries, John[98]
Jennex, Thomas
Johonnot, Francis
Johonnot, Peter[99]
Joy, John
Kerland, Patrick
King, Edward
Kirk, Thomas
Knight, Thomas
Knutton, John[100]
Knutton, William
Laughton, Henry
Laughton, Joseph
Lawler, Ellis
Lazarus, Samuel
Lear, Christopher
Lechmere, Richard[101]
Leddel, Henry
Lee, Henry
Lee, Judge Joseph[102]
Leonard, Daniel
Leonard, George
Leslie, James
Lewis, John
Lillie, Theophilus
Linkieter, Alexander[103]
Linning, Andrew
Lloyd, Henry[104]
Lloyd, Dr. James[105]
Lloyd, Samuel
Loring, Dr. Benjamin[106]
Loring, Joshua[107]
Loring, Joshua, Jr.[108]
Lovell, Benjamin[109]
Lovell, John[110]
Lowe, Charles
Lush, George
Lyde, Byfield[111]
Lyde, Edward[112]
Lyde, George
Lynch, Peter

McAlpine, William [113]
McClintock, Nathan
Macdonald, Dennis
McEwen, James
Mackay, Mrs.
McKean, Andrew
MacKinstrey, Mrs. [114]
McKown, John
McMaster, Daniel [115]
McMaster, James [116]
McMasters, Patrick
McMullen, Alexander
McNeil, Archibald
McNeil, William
Madden, Richard
Magner, John
Malcom, John [117]
Marston, Benjamin
Martin, William
Massingham, Isaac
Mather, Samuel
Mein, John [118]
Meserve, George
Mewse, Thomas
Miller, John
Mills, Nathaniel [119]
Minot, Christopher
Minot, Samuel
Mitchel, Thomas
Mitchelson, David
Moody, John
Moody, John, Jr.
Moore, Augustus
Moore, John
Morrison, John [120]
Morrow, Col.
Mossman, William
Mulcainy, Patrick [121]
Mulhall, Edward [122]
Murray, James
Murray, Col. John [123]
Murray, William
Newton, Richard
Nevin, Lazarus
Norwood, Ebenezer
Nunn, Samuel
Ochterlony, David [124]
Oliver, Andrew [125]
Oliver, Judge Peter [126]
Oliver, Dr. Peter [127]
Oliver, Thomas [128]
Oliver, Wm. Sanford [129]
O'Neil, Joseph
Orcutt, Joseph
Paddock, Adino [130]
Paddock, Adino, Jr.[131]
Page, George
Paine, Samuel
Parker, Rev. Samuel [132]
Parker, William
Pashley, George
Patten, George
Patterson, William
Paxton, Charles [133]
Pecker, Dr. James [134]
Pecker, Jeremiah
Pelham, Henry
Pemberton, Rev. Ebenezer [135]
Pepperell, Sir William (the younger) [136]
Perkins, Houghton [137]
Perkins, James [138]
Perkins, Dr. Nathaniel
Perkins, Dr. Wm. Lee [139]
Perry, William
Pettit, John Sam
Phillips, Benjamin
Phillips, Ebenezer
Phillips, John [140]
Phillips, Martha
Phips, David [141]
Pine, Samuel
Pitcher, Moses [142]
Pollard, Benjamin
Porter, James [143]
Powell, John
Powell, William D.
Price, Benjamin
Prince, Job
Prince, Samuel
Prout, Timothy
Putnam, James [144]
Putnam, James, Jr.[145]
Quincy, Samuel [146]
Ramage, John
Rand, Dr. Isaac [147]
Randall, Robert
Read, Charles
Reeve, Richard [148]
Rhodes, Henry
Rice, John
Richards, Owen
Richardson, Ebenezer [149]
Roberts, Frederic
Rogers, Jeremiah Dummer [150]
Rogers, Nathan
Rogers, Samuel
Rose, Peter
Rowth, Richard [151]
Royall, Isaac [152]
Ruggles, John [153]
Ruggles, Richard
Ruggles, Timothy
Rummer, Richard
Russell, Ezekiel [154]
Russell, James [155]
Russell, Nathaniel
Saltonstall, Leverett [156]
Saltonstall, Richard [157]
Sampson, John
Savage, Abraham
Savage, Arthur [158]
Scammel, Thomas
Scott, Joseph
Selby, John
Selkrig, James
Selkrig, Thomas
Semple, John
Semple, Robert
Semple, Thomas
Serjeant, John
Service, Robert
Sewall, Jonathan [159]
Sewall, Samuel [160]
Sheaffe, Nathaniel [161]
Sheaffe, Roger [162]
Sheaffe, Thos. Child [163]
Sheaffe, William [164]
Shepard, Joseph
Sherwin, Richard
Silsby, Daniel
Simmonds, William
Simpson, John
Simpson, Jeremiah
Simpson, Jonathan [165]
Simpson, William
Skinner, Francis
Smith, Edward
Smith, Henry [166]
Smith, Richard
Snelling, Jonathan [167]
Sparhawk, Samuel
Spillard, Timothy
Spooner, Ebenezer
Spooner, George
Stayner, Abigail
Stearns, Jonathan [168]
Sterling, Benj. Ferdin'd
Sterling, Elizabeth
Stevens, John [169]
Steward, Adam [170]
Story, William
Stow, Edward
Sullivan, Bartholomew
Sullivan, George
Taylor, Charles
Taylor, John
Taylor, Joseph [171]
Taylor, Nathaniel [172]
Taylor, William
Terry, Zebedee
Terry, William
Thayer, Arodi [173]
Thomas, Jonathan
Thomas, Nath'l Ray [174]
Thompson, George
Thompson, James
Timmins, John
Townsend, Gregory
Townsend, Shippy
Troutbeck, Rev. John [175]
Trowbridge, Edmund [176]
Tufts, Simon [177]
Tull, Thomas
Turill, Thomas
Vassall, John [178]
Vassall, William [179]
Vassall, William, Jr.[180]
Vincent, Ambrose
Waldo, Joseph [181]
Walter, Rev. William [182]
Warden, James
Warden, Joseph
Warden, William
Warren, Abraham
Waterhouse, Samuel
Welsh, James
Welsh, Peter
Wendell, Jacob
Wentworth, Edward [183]
Wheaton, Obadiah
Wheelwright, Job
Wheelwright, Joseph
Whiston, Obadiah
White, Gideon [184]
White, John [185]
Whitworth, Nathan'l [186]
Whitworth, Dr. Miles [187]
Whitworth, Dr. Miles, Jr.[188]
Willard, Abel [189]
Willard, Abijah [190]
Williams, Job [191]
Williams, John [192]
Williams, Seth [193]
Willis, David
Wilson, Archibald
Wilson, Joseph
Winnet, John, Jr.
Winslow, Edward [194]
Winslow, Edward, Jr. [195]
Winslow, Mrs. Hannah
Winslow, Isaac [196]
Winslow, John [197]
Winslow, Joshua
Winslow, Pelham [198]
Wittington, William
Woolen, William
Worral, Thos. Grooby
Wright, Daniel

NOTES.

[1] See his account of his own tribulations in *Mass. Hist. Soc. Proc.*, February, 1878.

[2] Brother of John. See Sabine, who shows how their descendants are well known among us now.

[3] Washington speaks of him during the siege as commanding the Scotch Company in Boston.

[4] Of Christ Church, Cambridge; the antagonist of Jonathan Mayhew.

[5] Estate settled by Martin Brimmer. Inventory in *Mass. Archives*, "Royalists," i. 425.

[6] Estate settled by John Scollay.

[7] Died in Boston in 1806.

[8] Estate settled by Saml. G. Jarvis. See Vol. II. and IV. index. His house is shown in Vol II p. 343.

[9] Connected with the Saltonstalls. See Sabine.

[10] Estate settled by Joseph Smith. See Vol. II. index. Governor Bernard had left the country in 1769, but his estate was confiscated ten years later. It comprised fifty acres.

[11] His wife was a daughter of Benjamin Faneuil. He died at Cambridge in 1785.

[12] Went to England in 1774; returned in 1778; was imprisoned; but being released went to Nova Scotia, where he attained distinction and died in 1842.

[13] Estate settled by Richard Cranch. Inventory taken April 9, 1776; sold March, 1778. *Mass. Archives*. "Royalists," i. 423. See Vol. II. index. See Sabine.

[14] Estate settled by Israel Hutchinson. Died in England in 1825.

[15] See the chapter on the Huguenots in Vol. II.

[16] Died in England in 1805.

[17] John Boylston, son of Dr Zabdiel Boylston, left Boston in 1768, and lived afterward in London and Bath, whence his letters through the war evinced his kindly feelings for his townsmen, and he did much to relieve the sufferings of the American prisoners at Forton. In his will dated at Bath, in 1793, he makes a bequest "to the poor and decayed householders of the town of Boston," and for "the nurture and instruction of poor orphans and deserted children of the town of Boston, until fourteen years of age." The City Auditor's reports show that these funds now exceed one hundred thousand dollars. *N. E. Hist. & Geneal. Reg.*, April, 1881.

[18] Died in London in 1798, ruined in fortune and broken in heart.

[19] Name changed from Hallowell; was the son of Benjamin Hallowell, named below. He returned to Boston in 1800, and died at Roxbury in 1828.

[20] Recovered his patrimony by act of the Legislature in 1784, and died in 1801.

[21] Died in Halifax in 1809.

[22] H. C. 1744; died in England in 1784.

[23] Perhaps the captain of one of the tea-ships.

[24] Commissioner of Customs.

[25] See Vol. II. index, and Mr. Scudder's chapter in this volume.

[26] See Vol. II index, and Mr. Goddard's chapter in this volume.

[27] Estate settled by Samuel Partridge; son of John Calef, of Ipswich; died in Virginia in 1801.

[28] Estate settled by Levi Jennings. See Rev. Dr. Brooks's chapter in this volume. This estate is now covered in part by the building of the Mass. Hist. Society.

[29] A refugee in Boston; embarked in 1776.

[30] Returned to Boston in 1788, and died in Roxbury in 1792. His property escaped confiscation.

[31] Returned after the war; settled in South Carolina, and died in Boston.

[32] From Worcester; took refuge in Boston in 1774, and embarked in 1776. Died in 1800 in London. George Bancroft is his grandson. The three names following are those of his brothers.

[33] He fled into Boston in 1775; and left with the troops; became distinguished in Nova Scotia.

[34] See a previous page in this volume.

[35] Son of Richard

[36] One of the consignees of the Tea, and father-in-law of Copley the artist. Died in England in 1795.

[37] Son of William, Jr.

[38] Son of Nathaniel, the Receiver-General.

[39] Died in New York, in 1780; father of Sir Isaac Coffin. See Editorial Note to chap. I. of Vol. IV.

[40] Son of William, Jr.; graduated at Harvard College in 1772.

[41] Son of Nathaniel, the Receiver-General.

[42] See Mr. Arthur Dexter's chapter in Vol. IV.

[43] A great-grandson of the first minister of Boston; died in Boston in 1776; was royal deputy secretary.

[44] Carted to the British lines in Rhode Island in 1777.

[45] Died respected in Nova Scotia in 1820.

[46] Of Northborough; sent into Boston by General Ward; left with the troops in 1776.

[47] Remained in Boston after the siege. See Dr. Green's chapter in Vol. IV.

[48] Of Charlestown.

[49] Lived where the Horticultural Hall stands; died in England in 1791.

[50] Died in England in 1779.

[51] Sabine says "Deonezzan."

[52] Widow of Richard; died in England in 1800.

[53] See Vol. II. 392.

[54] Married a daughter of Dr. Sylvester Gardiner. See Vol. II. 268.

[55] Merchant; embarked in 1776; died in London in 1806; married daughter of Isaac Royall.

[56] An eminent merchant; died in Boston, in 1786. See Vol. II. index.

[57] H. C. 1747; embarked in 1776; died in England in 1816; married a daughter of Governor Shirley. His son, Dr. Shirley Erving, died in Boston in 1813. See Vol. II. p. 539.

[58] An eminent merchant; died in Cambridge in 1785. See Vol. II. index.

[59] Son of Wilfred.

[60] Printer; partner of Mein. See Mr. Goddard's chapter in Vol. II.

[61] Estate settled by Joseph Pierce. Of his family there is some account in Drake's *Life of Knox*, appendix. Died in England in 1783.

[62] Commanded the Loyal Irish Volunteers in Boston during the siege.

[63] See *ante* in this chapter, and Vol. II. index.

[64] Estate settled by Nathaniel Gorham. Banished, 1778. Perkins's *Copley*, 56; *Heraldic Journal*, iv. 98; Sabine, i. 461; see also Vol. II. p. 558.

[65] Son of Rev. Dr. Gay, of Hingham; left with the troops in 1776.

[66] Son of Martin; H.C. 1775; went to New Brunswick.

[67] Returned and restored to citizenship in 1789; was grandfather of Capt. Marryat, the novelist.

[68] Born in Boston, 1730; banished 1778; Major of British army. See Perkins's *Copley*, 57.

[69] Left with the troops in 1776; citizenship restored in 1787; died in Boston in 1796; father of Governor Christopher Gore.

[70] Estate settled by Joseph Henderson. Perkins's *Copley*, p. 68. See Harrison Gray Otis's defence of the character of his grandfather, Harrison Gray, in Loring's *Boston Orators*, p. 191.

[71] Son of Harrison Gray.

[72] See Sabine, i. 490; who gives a brother John Gray, not to be confounded with John, the son of Harrison.

[73] Brother of Joseph.

[74] Died in Boston in 1807.

[75] Citizenship restored in 1789; died in 1812.

[76] Died at Boston in 1817.

[77] Graduated at Harvard College, 1760; after some years spent in Nova Scotia and England, he returned to Medford in 1797, and died there in 1809.

[78] Estate settled by Dr. Thomas Bulfinch. "An inventory of the goods and effects found in the house of Joseph Green in School Lane, improved by John Andrews," is in the *Mass. Archives*, "Royalists," i. 433. See his portrait in Mr. Goddard's chapter in this volume.

[79] Sheriff, died in Boston in 1795.

[80] Lawyer; H. C. 1751; embarked with the troops in 1776.

[81] Commanded the "Dartmouth," one of the tea-ships in 1773; proscribed in 1778.

[82] Estate settled by John Winthrop. See Vol. II. p. 343; Drake's *Town of Roxbury*, 408. The heirs of Mrs. Hallowell, in whom was the fee, subsequently recovered the estate. *N. E. Hist. and Geneal. Reg.*, April, 1858, p. 72. His sons were Sir Benjamin Hallowell Carew, and Ward Nicholas Boylston.

[83] Estate settled by Zephion Thayer. He was Comptroller of the Customs. He left with the troops in March, 1776; after the war he returned to America, and in 1792 lived in Batterymarch Street, but removed to Gardiner, Me., in 1816, and died there in 1818. He was brother of Benjamin.

[84] Collector of Customs in 1768.

[85] Son of Joseph.

[86] Of Dorchester; H. C. 1742.

[87] Chief butcher to the British army during the siege. His shop was on the south corner of Washington Street and Harvard Place, opposite the old South. Drake's *Landmarks*, p. 270. Died in Boston in 1813.

[88] Printer; finally returned, and died at Newton.

[89] Father of Hon. Joseph Howe, distinguished in Canadian politics.

[90] Estate settled by Edward Carnes. His property included Shirley Hall in Roxbury, shown in the frontispiece of Vol. II., and his wife was Governor Shirley's daughter. He died in 1775.

[91] Son of the Governor; partner of Thomas, Jr.; died in England in 1824.

[92] Estate settled by Joshua Pico; brother of the Governor; died in Nova Scotia in 1799.

[93] Governor Hutchinson's estate in Milton was sold in 1779 for £38,038. *Mass. Archives*, "Royalists," ii. 65. Died in England in 1780.

[94] Died in England in 1811; son of the Governor.

[95] Died in Cambridge in 1788.

[96] Died in England in 1810.

[97] Returned, and died at Milton in 1812.

[98] Estate settled by Dr. Scollay. He graduated at Harvard College, 1763; left Boston with the troops in 1776; returned in 1790; died in 1819.

[99] Distiller; died in London in 1809.

[100] Died in New Brunswick in 1827.

[101] Estate settled by Mungo Mackay. He died in England in 1814.

[102] Was allowed to remain in Cambridge; died in 1802.

[103] Sabine gives it "Linkletter."

[104] Died in London in 1795 or 1796.

[105] See Dr. Green's chapter in Vol. IV.

[106] Returned, and died in Boston in 1798.

[107] Estate settled by John Fenno. See Vol. II. p. 344; Drake's *Town of Roxbury*, p. 416. His estate in Roxbury was sold, June 1779, for £26,486. 6s. 3d. *Mass. Archives*, "Royalists," ii 66. It comprised seventy-two acres. His house in Boston was "next the south writing school, adjoining on the Common." He was commissary of prisoners in New York, and is charged with cruelty in his treatment of them. There was a witticism current among the British that he fed the dead and starved the living, — alluding to his practice of charging for supplies to prisoners long after their death, and giving scant allowance to others. Moore's *Diary*, ii. 110. Died in England in 1781.

[108] Died in England in 1789.

[109] Son of John Lovell; died in England in 1828.

[110] The school-master. See Vol. II. index. Died in Halifax in 1778.

[111] Died at Halifax in 1776.

[112] Died at New York in 1812.

[113] Printer and bookbinder, opposite the Old South. Died in Glasgow in 1788.

[114] Her husband, Dr. William McKinstrey, died in the harbor, before sailing, in March, 1776; she afterward returned and died at Haverhill in 1786. See Sabine.

[115] Died in New Brunswick in 1830.

[116] Died in New Brunswick in 1804.

[117] Customs officer of Portland; but suffered his tribulations in Boston in 1774. See Sabine.

[118] Printer; he fled from Whig wrath as early as 1769. See Mr. Goddard's chapter in Vol. II.

[119] Printer; went to Nova Scotia.

[120] A New Hampshire minister, who left the American camp after Bunker Hill and went into Boston; preached at Brattle Street Church and became a commissary. See Sabine.

[121] Sabine gives it "Mulcarty."

[122] Sabine gives it "Mulball."

[123] Of Rutland; fled into Boston in 1774; left with the British in 1776; died at St. John in 1794.

[124] He lived at the lower corner of North and Centre streets in a house still standing. His son of the same name became a baronet. Drake's *Landmarks*, 153; Sabine, ii. 121.

[125] Son of Daniel Oliver; Lieut.-Governor; died in Boston in 1774.

[126] Died in England in 1791.

[127] Of Middleborough; fled to Boston; died in England in 1822.

[128] The last royal Lieut.-Governor; lived at "Elmwood," Cambridge, and in 1774, moved into Boston; left with the troops; died in England in 1782.

[129] Son of Andrew; died at St. John, 1813. For the Oliver family, see Vol. I. p. 580; II. 539.

[130] Estate settled by William Bant. See chap. I. in this volume. He died in the Isle of Jersey in 1804.

[131] Became surgeon on the British side; died in New Brunswick in 1817.

[132] See Mr. Goddard's and Dr. Brooks's chapters in this volume.

[133] Estate settled by Joseph Shed; Commissioner of Customs. His portrait is in the Hist. Soc. gallery. See chap. I. in this volume. Left with the troops. Died in England in 1788.

[134] Died in 1794.

[135] Pastor of Old North Church. See Dr. McKenzie's chapter in Vol. II.

[136] The grandson of the first Sir William. He lived where Otis Place now is. He was son of Col. Nathaniel Sparhawk, the son-in-law of the first Sir William; and assumed the name, and was subsequently created baronet. He married the daughter of Isaac Royall. He was the first president of an association of Loyalists formed in London, in 1779, and was pensioned by the British government. See Sabine, ii. 171. He died in London in 1876.

[137] Died in Halifax in 1778.

[138] Arrested in 1776; died in his home, on the site of the Tremont House, in 1803.

[139] Died in England in 1797.

[140] Died in Boston in 1794.

[141] Son of Lieut.-Governor Spencer Phips; colonel of a troop of guards in Boston; died in England in 1811.

[142] Died in Halifax in 1817.

[143] Comptroller-General of the Customs; embarked in 1776.

[144] Driven into Boston from Worcester, and left with the troops; and died in New Brunswick in 1789.

[145] Son of preceding; died in England in 1838.

[146] See Vol. II. 546, and Mr. Morse's chapter in Vol. IV. Samuel Quincy, who succeeded Sewall as Solicitor-General, was his cousin; and when Quincy's younger brother, Josiah the Patriot, rose to eminence, a natural disappointment in the older son was used by Hutchinson and Sewall to seduce him from the Patriot cause; and thus he shared the fortunes of his expatriated associates. An inventory of the confiscated library of Samuel Quincy is given in *Mass.*

Archives, "Royalists," i. 415. This estate was settled by Thomas Crofts.

147 He was inactive in politics and remained in Boston.

148 Died in England in 1789.

149 He shot the boy Snider. See chap. I. of this volume.

150 Graduated at Harvard College, 1762; took refuge in Boston; commissary to British troops in Charlestown; left with them, and died at Halifax in 1784. The grandfather of the Rev. Drs. Geo. E. and Rufus Ellis.

151 Collector at Salem; left with the troops.

152 Lived in Medford; left in 1778; closely connected with leading Boston Loyalists. See Brooks's *Medford*.

153 Took refuge in Boston in 1774; left with the troops; and died in Nova Scotia in 1795.

154 Printer; died in 1796.

155 Of Charlestown; died in 1798; grandfather of James Russell Lowell.

156 Was in commercial life in Boston; left with the British; and served under Cornwallis.

157 Took refuge in Boston from Haverhill; left in 1775; died in England in 1788.

158 Auctioneer; died in England in 1801.

159 Fled from Cambridge and took refuge in Boston in 1774; returned from England to New Brunswick; and died there in 1776.

160 Estate settled by John McLane; died in London in 1811.

161 Son of William.

162 The young son of William Sheaffe; protégé of Lord Percy; afterwards Sir Roger Hale Sheaffe, bart.; revisited Boston in 1788, 1792–93, 1803 and 1806; died at Edinburgh 1851.

163 Son of William; died in Boston before 1793.

164 Deputy Collector of Customs. Sabine gives an account of the family.

165 Died in Boston in 1834.

166 Went to Halifax; returned, and died in Boston in 1801.

167 Commander of the Governor's guard; lived opposite Eliot's Church in Hanover Street; went to Halifax; died there in 1782. His son Jonathan married a daughter of Foster Hutchinson, and died in Halifax in 1809.

168 Took refuge in Boston, and left with the troops.

169 Of Charlestown; died 1792.

170 Carted to the British lines at Rhode Island in 1777.

171 Proscribed in 1778; returned, and died in Boston in 1816.

172 Proscribed in 1778; died in Quebec in 1806.

173 Proscribed in 1778, but returned and settled in Dorchester, where he died in 1831.

174 Took refuge in Boston as a mandamus councillor, and died in Nova Scotia in 1791.

175 Assistant rector of King's Chapel.

176 See Mr. Morse's chapter in Vol. IV.

177 Proscribed in 1778; died in 1802.

178 Of Cambridge, in 1775; took refuge in Boston; died in England in 1797.

179 Brother of John; died in England in 1800.

180 Son of William; died in England in 1843.

181 Died in England in 1816.

182 Rector of Trinity Church; in 1776 went to England; returned in 1791; became rector of Christ Church, and died in 1800; grandfather of Lynde M. Walter, founder of the Boston *Transcript*.

183 Died in Boston in 1794.

184 Fled from Plymouth into Boston; and was at Bunker Hill on the British side.

185 Died in Boston in 1794.

186 Died in Europe in 1799.

187 Attended in Boston the Provincials wounded and made prisoners at Bunker Hill; died in Boston in 1779.

188 Died in England in 1778.

189 Accompanied the British in 1776; died in England in 1781.

190 Of Lancaster; left with the troops in 1776; died in New Brunswick in 1789.

191 Cut down "Liberty Tree." See Mr. Scudder's chapter. Left with the British.

192 Inspector-General of the Customs.

193 Of Taunton; took refuge in Boston; and left in 1776.

194 Brother of General John; took refuge in Boston; embarked in 1776; died in 1784.

195 Son of Edward; joined the royal army in Boston in 1775, and became a colonel; died in New Brunswick in 1815. See Vol. II. pp. 124, 551.

196 See Drake's *Town of Roxbury*, p. 256. Embarked in 1776; died in London in 1790.

197 General Winslow, whose portrait is given in Vol. II. p. 123; considered by Sabine a "prerogative man;" died in 1774; and his widow is said to have embarked with the troops in March, 1776.

198 Son of General John, of Plymouth; took refuge in Boston in 1774; embarked in 1776; died in Brooklyn in 1783.

AFTER THE EVACUATION. — Howe had begun his embarkation early in the morning of Sunday, March 17. By nine o'clock he withdrew his guard from Charlestown, and soon after the last boats put off from the wharves. "From Penn's hill," writes Abigail Adams from Braintree, March 17, 1775, "we have a view of the largest fleet ever seen in America. You may count upwards of a hundred and seventy sail. They look like a forest." — *Familiar Letters*, 142. The American advance pushed forward cautiously down the Charlestown peninsula, and found the works tenanted only by wooden sentinels. A strong force embarked in boats on the Charles and fell down the river, prepared to act as might be required. A detachment from Roxbury under Colonel Learned entered the works on the Neck, and, unopposed, unbarred the gates. The entry was made under the immediate command of Putnam, who proceeded to seize the principal posts. On the 20th, the main body of the troops entered,[1] and the next day Washington, who still kept his headquarters at Cambridge, issued the proclamation given (on next page) in reduced fac-simile from a copy in the library of the Massachusetts Historical Society.

An inventory of the stores, ordnance, and vessels left by the British was made March 18 and 19, and is printed in the *Siege of Boston*, p. 406. Some of the cannon are now to be seen on Cambridge Common, about the Soldier's Monument. Drake's *Landmarks of Middlesex*, 265.

Dr. John Warren's account of the condition of the town is given in Loring's *Hundred Boston Orators*, p. 161; and with a statement of the strength of the works left by the British, in Frothingham's *Siege of Boston*, 329; and in the *Life of Dr. John Warren*, by his son Edward Warren, Boston, 1873, which has a portrait, en-

[1] Dr. John Warren's diary chronicles the action of the enemy this same day: "March 20th. This evening they burn the castle and demolish it, by blowing up all the fortifications there. They leave not a building standing."

BY HIS EXCELLENCY

George Washington, Esq:

Captain-General and Commander in Chief of the Forces of the *Thirteen* United Colonies.

WHEREAS the Miniſterial Army have abandoned the Town of BOSTON *: and the Forces of the United Colonies, under my Command, are in Poſſeſſion of the ſame :*

I HAVE therefore thought it neceſſary for the Preſervation of Peace, good Order and Diſcipline, to publiſh the following ORDERS, that no Perſon offending therein may plead Ignorance as an Excuſe for their Miſconduct.

ALL Officers and Soldiers are hereby ordered to live in the ſtricteſt Peace and Amity with the Inhabitants, and no Inhabitant, or other Perſon employed in his lawful Buſineſs in the Town, is to be moleſted in his Perſon or Property on any Pretence whatever —If any Officer or Soldier ſhall preſume to ſtrike, impriſon, or otherwiſe ill-treat any of the Inhabitants, they may depend on being puniſhed with the utmoſt Severity —And if any Officer or Soldier ſhall receive any Inſult from any of the Inhabitants, he is to ſeek Redreſs, in a legal Way, and no other.

ANY Non-commiſſioned Officer, Soldier, or others under my Command, who ſhall be guilty of robbing or plundering in the Town, are to be immediately confined, and will be moſt rigidly puniſhed —All Officers are therefore ordered to be very vigilant in the Diſcovery of ſuch offenders, and report their Names, and Crime, to the Commanding Officer in the Town, as ſoon as may be.

THE Inhabitants, and others, are called upon to make known to the Quarter-Maſter General, or any of his Deputies, all Stores belonging to the Miniſterial Army, that may be remaining or ſecreted in the Town : Any Perſon or Perſons whatever, that ſhall be known to conceal any of the ſaid Stores, or appropriate them to his or their own Uſe, will be conſidered as an Enemy of *America* and treated accordingly.

THE Selectmen, and other Magiſtrates of the Town, are deſired to return to the Commander in Chief, the Names of all or any Perſon or Perſons they may ſuſpect of being employed as Spies upon the Continental Army, that they may be dealt with accordingly.

ALL Officers of the Continental Army, are enjoined to aſſiſt the Civil Magiſtrates in the Execution of their Duty, and to promote Peace and good order,— They are to prevent, as much as poſſible, the Soldiers from frequenting Tapping Houſes, and ſtraggling from their Poſts —Particular Notice will be taken of ſuch Officers as are inattentive and remiſs in their Duty, and on the contrary, ſuch only who are active and vigilant, will be entitled to future Favor and Promotion.

GIVEN under my Hand at Head Quarters *in* Cambridge, *the Twenty firſt Day of* March, 1776.

GEORGE WASHINGTON

graved from the painting, now owned by Dr. John Collins Warren. It is Dr. John Warren's statements upon which the affirmation is sometimes made that the redoubt on Bunker Hill, found by the Americans, was one erected by the British after they had levelled the earthworks of June 17, 1775; but it seems probable, as Frothingham, p. 331, shows, that the British preserved, perhaps with modifications, the original redoubt.

There seems to have been left behind a considerable stock of the inhabitants' arms; for a memorandum on a letter, April 20, 1776, from the Provincial Congress at Watertown, signed by Wm. Sever, and asking of the selectmen a statement on this point (now in the Charity-building collection), has an endorsement on it: "1778 guns, 273 bayonets, 634 pistols, 38 blunderbuses, — inhabitants' arms." This enumeration, however, may refer to the number of arms which had been surrendered to Gage in April, 1775.

In the same collection is the following paper: —

"*Copy of acc. of losses the town sustained by the enemy. Given in Dec. 17, 1777.*

	£	s.	d.
Town stock of powder in the Powder House	250	6	8
149 small arms and bayonets	745	0	0
3 pr. pistols	12	0	0
Town library	0	0	0
King George the 2d picture, full length, Gen Conway, do., Col. Barré, do., Peter Faneuil, Esq, do., Gov. Shirley, do. — in Faneuil Hall	133	6	8
	1140	13	4"

The portraits of Conway and Barré were the ones ordered by the town in their joy at the repeal of the Stamp Act.

John Adams (*Familiar Letters*, p. 216), speaks of the portraits of Conway and Barré as by Reynolds; but the *Life of Reynolds*, by Leslie and Tom Taylor, i. 257, makes no mention of them, although Sir Joshua painted Barre more than once.

Abigail Adams writes, March 31, 1776, to her husband: "The town in general is left in a better state than we expected. . . . Some individuals discovered a sense of honor and justice, and have left the rent of the houses, in which they were, for the owners, and the furniture unhurt, or, if damaged, sufficient to make it good. Others have committed abominable ravages. The mansion house of your president [Hancock] is safe and the furniture unhurt; while the house and furniture of the Solicitor-General [Samuel Quincy] have fallen a prey to their own merciless party." — *Familiar Letters*, p. 149.

Greene succeeded Putnam for a short time; but upon Washington's leaving for New York he placed Ward in command; and in his instructions, April 4, 1776, he particularly enjoined upon him to arrange some system of signals by which to rouse the country in case of the approach of a hostile fleet. *Heath Papers*, in 5 *Mass. Hist. Coll.*, iv. 4.

Mr. Samuel F. McCleary printed in the *N. E. Hist. and Geneal. Reg.* (1876), vol. xxx. p. 380, and in succeeding volumes, the records of the Boston Committee of Correspondence, Inspection, and Safety, from May to November, 1776.

On the 17th of May the "Franklin," a small craft under the command of an adventurous Marbleheader, Captain Mugford, whom Ward had commissioned, boldly attacked, just off the harbor, a large armed ship — the "Hope" — bringing supplies to the town, then supposed to have a British garrison. British ships were still in Nantasket Roads, and saw the engagement, but failed to render any assistance; and Mugford carried his prize through the Broad Sound into Boston. She had on board one hundred half-barrels of powder, — a much needed addition to the Continental store. Two days later, the "Franklin" grounded in trying to escape from the harbor, and was attacked by boats from the English fleet; but they were repelled, at the cost, however, of Mugford's life. See Force's *American Archives*, 4th ser. vi. 494–96, 532, 629; Gordon's *American Revolution*, ii. 264; Moore's *Diary of the American Revolution*, i. 244.

A good deal of good service was now done in this way by Captain Tucker, who intercepted more than one important British supply-ship and brought them into Boston, where his presence was not unfamiliar throughout the war. He had before this prepared some fireships at Germantown to send down among the fleet, but the very day he was ready the fleet sailed. *Familiar Letters of John and Abigail Adams*, p. 156 (April 14, 1776).

In June better organized efforts were made to drive off a few ships of the British which still lingered in Nantasket Roads. Detachments under Colonels Marshall and Whitney, and some artillery under Lieutenant Crafts, joined with some Continental troops and coast guards, the whole under the command of General Lincoln, took post at commanding points in the lower harbor and brought their guns to bear on the "Commodore" frigate and the other attendant vessels, which had recently been joined by a fleet of transports with troops. The demonstration caused them all soon to put to sea. Adams's *Familiar Letters*, p. 185; Moore's *Diary*, i. 251.

The admiral had kept a detachment on the lighthouse island to protect that structure; but when the fleet finally left, these men were taken off, but not until they had laid a train by which the tower was thrown down; and it was not till 1783 that the present lighthouse was erected. Shurtleff's *Description of Boston*, p. 572.

A day or two later the Continental brig "Defence," of Connecticut, captured in the bay two armed transports with Highlanders on board, and brought them safely in under the newly mounted guns at Nantasket. The "Defence" was aided by a small privateer under Captain Burk. (*Familiar Letters of John Adams*, p. 187.) In July a fleet of the enemy hovered about the bay for a week, but left without attempting hostile acts. (Ibid. p. 201.) In September, "the 'Milford' frigate rides triumphant in our bay, taking vessels every day, and no Colony or Continental vessel has yet attempted to hinder her. She mounts but twenty-eight guns, and is one of the fastest sailers in the British navy. They complain we have not weighty metal enough, and I suppose truly." — Ibid. p. 226.

A committee of the Provincial Congress, with James Sullivan at the head, had soon been appointed to consider a plan for fortifying the approaches to Boston by water; and Sullivan was also named first on a committee for carrying his report into execution. Under General Lincoln's direction the works at Fort Hill, on Dorchester Heights, and on Noddle's Island were completed, and hulks were sunk in the channel. The Congress provided the cannon left by the enemy as an armament for them. The letters written by John Adams to his wife show his anxiety at the delays in this work. In one of her replies, May 9, she says: "I believe Noddle's Island has been done by subscription. Six hundred inhabitants of the town meet every morning in the Town House, from whence they march with fife and drum, with Mr. Gordon, Mr. Skilman, and Mr. Lothrop at their head, to the Long Wharf, where they embark for the island; and it comes to the subscribers' turn to work two days in the week." *Familiar Letters*, p. 171.

Later in the year, when Massachusetts answered renewed calls for troops for the New York campaign, Boston was left exposed to sudden incursions from the enemy. In December the regiments in the harbor were prevailed upon to continue their service, and additional regi-

ments were ordered to be raised for the same service.

INDEPENDENCE DECLARED. — There was published some years since in the (British) *United Service Journal* an account of the way Independence was first proclaimed in Boston, written by a British officer, who in June, 1776, had been captured on board a transport in the bay, and was then held as a prisoner in the town. He was invited, with other officers then on parole, to the Town House, on the 18th of July. "As we passed through the town," he says, "we found it thronged; all were in their holiday suits; every eye beamed with delight, and every tongue was in rapid motion. The streets adjoining the Council Chamber were lined with detachments of infantry tolerably equipped, while in front of the jail [Court Street] artillery was drawn up, the gunners with lighted matches. The crowd opened a lane for us, and the troops gave us, as we mounted the steps, the salute due to officers of our rank. . . . Exactly as the clock struck one, Colonel [Thomas] Crafts, who occupied the chair, rose and read aloud the Declaration. This being finished, the gentlemen stood up, and each, repeating the words as they were spoken by an officer, swore to uphold the rights of his country. Meanwhile the town clerk read from a balcony the Declaration to the crowd; at the close of which a shout, begun in the hall, passed to the streets, which rang with loud huzzas, the slow and measured boom of cannon, and the rattle of musketry. . . . There was a banquet in the Council Chamber, where all the richer citizens appeared; large quantities of liquor were distributed among the mob; and when night closed in, darkness was dispelled by a general illumination."

The scene is also described by Mrs. Adams in her letters, July 21, *Familiar Letters*, p. 204, and in the *New England Chronicle*, July 25.

It was now in front of the old historic Bunch of Grapes tavern, on the upper corner of State and Kilby streets, that all portable signs of royalty in the town, — such as the arms from the Town House, the Court House, and the Custom House, — were brought and thrown in a pile to make a bonfire.

The first anniversary (July 4, 1777) of the Declaration of Independence was celebrated in Boston with great parade, a sermon by Dr. Gordon before the Legislature, a public dinner, and much booming of cannon. Moore's *Diary*, i. 463.

A copy of the broadside Declaration of Independence, attested in script, "A true copy, John Hancock, Presid^{t}," is in *Mass. Archives*, cxlii. 23. It is one of the copies sent to each of the States by order of Congress, Jan. 18, 1777, and is marked in print "Baltimore, in Maryland; printed by Mary Katharine Goddard." With it is Hancock's letter transmitting it to the Massachusetts authorities. There is in the Public Library another copy of the same broadside, on which is written "Attest, Cha. Thomson, Secy. A True Copy, John Hancock, Presid^{t}." It is not evident to which of the States it was sent, if indeed it is one of those sent to the States.

GENERAL HEATH IN COMMAND. — In 1777 General Heath[1] succeeded Ward in command. His headquarters were in the house of Thomas Russell, which was in Summer Street, about where Otis Street is. Major Andrew Symmes had the immediate charge of the garrison of the town. During the summer an uncertainty as to the destination of the British fleet, then preparing to leave Newport, caused some uneasiness and renewed vigilance, and precautions were taken for alarming the country in case of impending danger. (See order in fac-simile on next page). Signals for announcing the approach of an enemy's ship to Hull, were arranged by the Council Sept. 10, 1777, and they are given in the *Mass. Archives*, cxlii. 105. Mrs. Adams describes the fright: "All Boston was in confusion, packing up and carting out of town household furniture, military stores, goods, etc. Not less than a thousand teams were employed on Friday and Saturday." — *Familiar Letters*, p. 287.

It was during Heath's term of service here in Boston that the army of Burgoyne, which had surrendered at Saratoga in October, 1777, was marched to Cambridge. The news of the surrender had preceded them, and was received with illuminations, bonfires, and cannon. Moore's *Diary*, i. 513. The provincial authorities had lost no time in chartering a swift vessel to carry the news to the Commissioners in Paris. The despatches were entrusted to Jonathan Loring Austin; and after prayers had been said by Dr. Chauncy in the old Brick Meeting-house, the vessel sailed, and reached Nantes in safety in November. Loring, *Boston Orators*, p. 174.

The English reached Prospect Hill November 6, and were put into barracks there. The Hessians arrived the next day at Winter Hill, and were quartered there. General Burgoyne, who entered Cambridge in a pelting storm at the head of his troops, was lodged temporarily at Bradish's tavern, now known as Porter's; but subsequently was quartered at the house opposite Gore Hall, known as the Bishop's Palace.

[1] A portrait of General Heath is owned by Mrs. G. Brewer, of Boston. An old oval, engraved portrait of him is marked "H. Williams, pinxt. I. R. Smith, sculp." There is a copy in the Historical Society's Library. General Heath's estate lay in Roxbury at the foot of Parker's Hill, and is now bisected by Heath Street. Here, on the easterly corner of that street and Bickford Avenue, the homestead stood. It was demolished in 1843. Drake's *Town of Roxbury*, p. 386.

The British artillery was parked on Cambridge Common. General Riedesel and his wife were established in the Jonathan Sewall house, on the corner of Brattle and Sparks streets. The camps of the "Convention troops," as they were called in allusion to the terms of their conditional surrender, were guarded by Massachusetts militia, while the officers signed a parole not to pass beyond specified limits.

This document is referred to by Barry (iii. 146) as being in the possession of J. W. Thornton, Esq., and as if it were the original convention paper signed at Saratoga by Burgoyne and his officers. One sheet is subscribed by Burgoyne and the English officers; and the other by Riedesel and the German officers. Mr. Thornton put it into the great Sanitary Fair held in Boston, with the understanding that it should be given to the Public Library if $1000 were subscribed for the objects of the Fair; and this being done, the interesting document, which was originally among the Heath papers, passed in 1864 into that depository.

The Convention troops proved a rather turbulent set. The militia were not disciplined, and encounters not infrequently occurred between the prisoners and their guards. Some blood and even life was lost; and at last Colonel David Henley, who was in command in Cambridge, was charged by Burgoyne with cruelty and unsoldierly conduct, and brought to trial. Colonel Glover presided, and Colonel William Tudor acted as judge-advocate. Henley was acquitted. He had been brigade-major to Heath during the siege. In the summer and autumn of 1778 apprehension arose that the British might make an attempt to rescue the prisoners by landing near Boston; and so by detach-

ments the Convention troops were sent under guard into the interior of the State. The last of them left on the 15th of October; but some thirty or forty of the worst characters were left behind confined in the guardships in the the harbor. In



November, as is well known, the prisoners were marched to Virginia. See the authorities enumerated in Winsor's *Readers' Handbook of the Revolution*, p. 149.

In November the Baron Steuben had arrived at Portsmouth, eager to throw his influence and





skill into the American cause. Coming to Boston he found the community elated over the capture of Burgoyne, and addressed a letter at once to Gates, "the conqueror of Burgoyne," commending himself to his attention. We cannot follow him to Valley Forge, nor relate here the benefit which came to the camp there from his devotion.

Late in the summer of 1778 the expedition which was intended to drive out the British from Newport, and with which Hancock had gone as Major-General in command of the Massachusetts militia, came to nought. The French fleet blockading the English had been scattered in a gale; and on returning to the blockade they were not prevailed upon to assist in an attack, but sailed for Boston, leaving Sullivan, who had charge of the expedition, to extricate himself as best he could. Arrived in Boston late in August, the French repaired their vessels and replenished their stores. Lafayette came to Boston and endeavored to prevail upon the French Admiral, D'Estaing, to remain on the coast; while Howe, following the French, had come within the Capes with his fleet, as if eager for a battle. The contingency was alarming, and nine regiments of militia were ordered to Boston; but the danger passed when Howe withdrew. Mrs. Adams, mentioning the hospitalities which the French officers extended on board their ships, adds: "I cannot help saying that they have been neglected in the town of Boston. Generals Heath and Hancock have done their part; but very few, if any, private families have any acquaintance with them." (*Familiar Letters*, p. 342.) Hancock entertained them at a "superb ball" in Concert Hall, October 29. (Moore's *Diary*, ii. 88, 102.) The French left for the West Indies in November, and the regiments went home.

General Gates in Command. — In the autumn of 1778 (November 6) General Gates[1] succeeded Heath in the command in Boston. He came with his wife and a suite, and the people welcomed him kindly. Here he continued till the following spring; but his stay was not altogether an agreeable one. William Palfrey writes to General Greene in January, 1779, of the condition of affairs during Gates's command in Boston: "There seems to be a coolness between Hancock and General Gates. Neither they nor their ladies have visited each other. General G. seems not very well pleased with his situation, and I believe wishes most heartily to return to his Sabine fields. His family have been involved in quarrels almost ever since they have been in the place, which bid fair to proceed to such a length that the civil authority thought proper to interpose. Mr. Bob. Gates and Mr. [John] Carter have fought; but it proved a bloodless encounter." Sargent's *Loyalist Poetry*, 160.

The duel thus referred to took place on the last day of the year, in a pasture near the Roxbury Meeting-house. Gates missed Carter, and Carter refused to fire.

The Penobscot Expedition. — This was seemingly the most formidable and actually the most luckless expedition which Boston sent out during the course of the war. There have been various incidental accounts and illustrative contributions, as detailed in Winsor's *Readers' Handbook of the American Revolution*, p. 208; but during the present year the Weymouth Historical Society has published *The Original Journal of General Solomon Lovell, kept during the Penobscot Expedition, 1779, with a Sketch of his Life*, by Gilbert Nash.

Lovell, as colonel of one of the Massachusetts regiments, had been at Dorchester Heights in 1776. The next year he was made the ranking officer of the militia of the seaboard, subordinate to the general of the department at Boston, — a position which he retained during the war. In 1778 he had



[1] Stuart's superb portrait of Gates is given in photogravure in Mason's *Stuart*, p. 183.

commanded a portion of this militia in the Rhode Island campaign of forty-seven days; and in October following, upon him had devolved the command of the militia hastily assembled at the apprehension of an attack from the British fleet.

In June, 1779, a British force had taken possession of a peninsula on Penobscot Bay, where now Castine is, in order to prevent that region being longer the resort of the active Boston and Salem cruisers, which were preying upon the British supply-ships as they approached the coast. The Massachusetts authorities, with assistance from New Hampshire, at once organized an expedition; and, June 26, put Lovell in command of twelve hundred militia and one hundred artillery. The "Warren," a new ship of thirty-two guns, and the "Providence," a sloop of twelve guns, both Continental vessels, were borrowed; and others were chartered and bought. Peleg Wadsworth, the adjutant-general

of the State, was placed second in command. Paul Revere, then a lieut.-colonel, was put in command of the artillery. The fleet dropped down to Nantasket Roads on the 15th of July, and sailed on the 19th. It consisted of nineteen armed vessels, mounting three hundred and twenty-four guns, manned by over two thousand men, with over twenty transports, — all commanded by Dudley Saltonstall, the captain of the "Warren." After landing on the Maine coast and receiving some recruits from York and Cumberland, of a dubious character, and a few Penobscot Indians, they reached the enemy's station on the 25th. The next day the troops made in part a successful landing; but they were unsupported by the fleet. Two or





three weeks were consumed in bickerings between the Commodore and the General, with right apparently on the side of Lovell; when a British fleet reinforced the enemy, and led in an attack on the American armed vessels and transports. The result was the destruction of the whole floating armament, and the thorough dispersion of the land forces through the neighboring wilderness. Lovell got back to Boston about the twentieth of September. A court of inquiry, with General Artemas Ward as chairman, exonerated Lovell, and blamed Saltonstall. Their report is in the *Massachusetts Archives*, cxlv., and is printed by Nash.

The Penobscot expedition-rolls are in *Revolutionary Rolls*, xxxvii. 83; with a list of vessels chartered for the service, p. 173, with orders, etc., p. 187. Vol. xxxviii. gives other papers; and also xxxix. p. 113. *Massachusetts Revolutionary Rolls*, xxviii. 58, gives the officers of the expedition, and also the officers of the Boston regiments, and two new regiments.

The Naval Service. — On Dec. 11, 1776, the Government of Massachusetts authorized Mr. John Peck to build an armed vessel of sixteen guns, of a new construction. She was built in Boston, called the "Hazard," was brig-rigged, and of peculiar model. She had a short but brilliant career, and took many prizes, some of them valuable. One was the British brig "Active," Captain Sims, of eighteen guns, sixteen swivels, and one hundred men, captured March 16, 1779, off St. Thomas, W. I., after a sharp action of thirty minutes, during which the "Hazard" lost three killed and five wounded, and the enemy thirteen killed and twenty wounded. She had also an action with a British ship of fourteen guns and eighty men, which, after several attempts to board, sheered off. In these engagements she was commanded by Captain John Foster Williams, who subsequently became celebrated as the commander of the "Protector." The "Hazard" was one of the unfortunate Penobscot expedition, and in August, 1779, was burned by her crew to prevent her falling into the hands of the enemy.

Mr. Peck, who modelled the "Hazard," was the most scientific naval architect whom the United Colonies had produced. Among the vessels built by him during the Revolution were the "Belisarius" and the "Rattlesnake," noted for their stability and swiftness. One hundred years ago it was a common remark that to have a perfect vessel it must have a Boston bottom and Philadelphia sides. The "Belisarius" does not appear on Emmons's Lists, but the "Rattlesnake," a ship of twenty guns, one hundred and eighty-five men, commanded by Mr. Clark in 1781, does. The British claim to have captured a cruiser of the name; but as there were no less than four schooners so named belonging to Pennsylvania, and one from South Carolina, it

may have been one of them. Emmons, in his usually accurate tables, says that the frigates "Hancock" (32), and "Boston" (24), were built in Boston, in 1776; but they were both built by Stephen and Ralph Cross at their yard in Newburyport, by order of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, and only equipped in Boston. The "Hancock" was launched July 5, 1776, the day after the Declaration of Independence, and before it had been noised abroad.

In March, 1777, Tucker was put in command of the "Boston;" and on Feb. 17, 1778, he sailed in her to convey John Adams to France on his diplomatic mission.

On the 9th of November, 1776, Congress authorized the purchasing or building of three vessels of seventy-four guns, five of thirty-six guns, one of eighteen guns, and one packet. One of the seventy-fours, and the only vessel of war ordered by the Continental Congress to be built at Boston, was commenced in the yard of Benjamin Goodwin, afterward known as Tilley's Wharf, a short distance from Charlestown. Thomas Cushing, afterward the Lieut.-Governor of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, as the agent of the Government, took possession of the dwelling-house, store, wharf, and yard of Goodwin for the purpose of building this ship. It is probable but little progress was made upon her, as we find in the *Journal of Congress*, July 25, 1777,—

"The Marine Committee having represented that the extravagant prices now demanded for all kinds of material used in shipbuilding, and the enormous wages required by tradesmen and laborers, render the building of ships of war already ordered by Congress, not only exceedingly expensive, but also difficult to be accomplished at this time," etc., wherefore it was

"*Resolved*, That the Marine Committee be empowered to put a stop to the building of such of the Continental ships of war already ordered by this Congress to be built, as they shall judge proper, and to resume the building of them again when they shall find it consistent with the interest of the United States to do so."

In 1784, the exigency having passed, the ship was sold on the stocks by Thomas Russell, as agent of the United States. The only seventy-four launched was the "Alliance," built under the superintendence of Paul Jones at Portsmouth, and presented to the French Government in 1782, to replace the "Magnifique," lost in Boston Harbor.

In September, 1777, James Sullivan writes from Boston: "A ship arrived yesterday with twelve thousand nine hundred bushels of salt, and other goods, taken by the 'Tyrannicide,' a Massachusetts brig. Several of our public vessels have arrived within this day or two, from France and Spain, with clothing, tents, and arms; one with ten thousand pounds sterling in value of Dutch cordage. The stores imported by the Massachusetts Board of War are immense."

There is in *Massachusetts Archives*, cxlii. 158, a paper signed by leading Boston merchants, agreeing to fit out two armed ships to protect vessels coming in and going out of the port of Boston. It is dated April 26, 1779.

In September, 1779, the two Continental frigates, "Boston," Captain Tucker, and "Deane," Captain Nicholson, arrived, bringing as prizes two British armed ships, with two hundred and fifty prisoners. Other of their prizes had been ordered to Philadelphia. *Boston Gazette*, Sept. 13, 1779; *Independent Chronicle*, Sept. 9, 1779. In 1780 Tucker, rich as he supposed from prize money, moved to Boston, and lived somewhat luxuriously for six years, in Fleet Street; when, meeting embarrassments in fortune, he returned to Marblehead: so Sheppard says in his *Life of Samuel Tucker*, 1868,—a performance of some value, but rather too jejune for an octogenarian to write.

Massachusetts built in 1779 a twenty-gun ship, the "Protector," and gave the command to John Foster Williams, Boston-born, and one of the most conspicuous of the enterprising searovers of the day. A recruiting office was opened on Hancock's Wharf, and by dint of daily parades with drum and fife a crew of two hundred and thirty men was got together; and the ship sailed from Nantasket Roads the first of April, 1780. Williams's first officer was a Marshfield man, Captain George Little, the same who twenty years later commanded the frigate "Boston." The "Protector's" second lieutenant was Joseph Cunningham of Boston. We have an account of her cruise from her log, now in the library of the New England Historical and Genealogical Society; from the *Revolutionary Adventures of Ebenezer Fox of Roxbury*, Boston, 1838; and from the Memoirs (MS.) of Captain Luther Little, who served on board as midshipman and prize-master. She engaged, June 9, an English letter-of-marque, eleven hundred tons, thirty-two guns, and after a severe fight the enemy's ship blew up. The "Protector" landed her sick on the coast of Maine, and came shortly after back to Boston to refit. On this second cruise, during which she sent one prize at least into Boston, commanded by Luther Little, she was overpowered off Nantucket by two English cruisers and taken into New York. Williams and George Little were carried to England, where the former remained as a prisoner till the war closed; while Little, bribing a sentry, escaped to France. See list of "Prisoners Committed to the Old Mill Prison," in *N. E. Hist. and Geneal. Reg.*, July, 1865, p. 209. There is much about American prisoners at Forton during the Revolutionary War, in *N. E. Hist. and Geneal. Reg.*, 1876–79. Washington appointed Williams to the command of the revenue cutter "Massachusetts," in 1790; and in


State of Massachusetts Bay, to Jos Wells — Dr.
1777
Aug 20 To making a pair Colors 44/ Rubd 19 — } 4.0.0
Painting a Pine Tree 1 Yd 24 — 3 — }
Per Brig Freedom Capt Clouston
To 22 ℔ Canvas Common Bunting Yards 2/ 2.4.0
Boston 6.4.0

this office he died, at seventy, in June, 1814. *N. E. Hist. and Geneal. Reg.*, January, 1848.

After the defeat of Comte de Grasse in the West Indies, in 1782, a section of his fleet, fourteen sail, under Admiral Vaubiard, arrived in Boston, Aug. 11, 1782; and one of his ships, the "Magnifique," entering by the narrows, was stranded on the bar at Lovell's Island, where her ribs are still embedded in the sand. Many attempts have been fruitlessly made to secure treasure from the wreck. One attempt, made forty or more years ago, gave no return except specimens of very beautiful wood of which the vessel was built. In July, 1859, another trial yielded copper, lead, and cannon-shot in considerable quantities. In 1868–69, when General Foster of the United States Engineers was widening the main ship-channel, his machines brought up, from a depth of more than twenty feet, large pieces of plank and oak timbers, which were thought to be a part of the wreck. The pilot under whose misdirection the vessel was lost became the sexton of the New North Church, and the wilful boys of the parish used to taunt him by chalking this couplet on the meeting-house door:—

> "Don't you run this ship ashore
> As you did the seventy-four."

(Shurtleff's *Description of Boston*, p. 552.) In October Mrs. Adams writes: "The French fleet still remain with us, and the British cruisers insult them. More American vessels have been captured since they have lain here than for a year before." — *Familiar Letters*, p. 407.

The Provincial Congress of Massachusetts, April 29, 1776, ordered the naval flag to be a green pine-tree upon a white ground, with an inscription, "Appeal to Heaven." The earliest representation of this emblematic pine-tree now known is found in the vignette of a contemporary French map, and is re-engraved in Frothingham's *Siege of Boston*, p. 262, and in Lossing's *Field-Book of the Revolution*, i. 570.

In the autumn of 1776, by orders of the council, the sloop "Freedom," commanded by John Clouston, and the sloop "Republick," commanded by John Foster Williams, had been ordered to Boston; and one of these vessels, at least as late as August of 1777, bore the pine-tree flag, as the annexed bill shows.

The Editor has used in this section some notes kindly furnished by Admiral George Henry Preble, as well as this writer's exhaustive *History of the American Flag*.

The Last Hundred Years.

PART I.

CHAPTER I.

THE LAST FORTY YEARS OF TOWN GOVERNMENT, 1782–1822.

BY HENRY CABOT LODGE, PH.D.

BETWEEN the Treaty of Peace at Paris, which acknowledged American Independence, and the change of local government in Boston from the form of a town to that of a city, forty years elapsed. That period was to Boston a season of growth and prosperity; the former slow, the latter brilliant at times, and at times clouded by the storms of war which then shook the civilized world. The heroic period in the history of the town in its corporate capacity closed when Washington marched in at the head of his army, and Lord Howe sailed out of Boston Harbor. In the years preceding that event Boston had been the most important name in the long list of English possessions. It had figured in the newspapers, in the conferences of cabinets and the debates of Parliament, with unrivalled frequency. It had lighted the flame of resistance, endured the first stroke of angry rulers, and had witnessed the first disaster to the British arms. During the Revolution, Boston — untouched after the first shock of war had passed away — had her share of glory and suffering; but she ceased to be the central point of resistance, or to attract further the attention of England and Europe. In the forty years which followed the close of the war the old town, as such, took no memorable action, with one or two rare exceptions which will be described in their place. During this period, therefore, the history of Boston is, in its most salient features, interwoven with that of national politics, and, above all, with the fate of a great political party, which found here some of its ablest and most steadfast leaders; and which here, too, preserved longer than anywhere else an almost unbroken ascendancy. The history of the town, then, at this time is to a large extent the history of a party and of the men who composed and led it. In those days subjects of

interest were few in the extreme. The fortunes of the Bostonians were involved in commerce, enterprising, far reaching, and successful;[1] but it may be fairly said, that outside of business and professional work the only intellectual excitement was found in politics; and to politics, consequently, all the strongest and ablest men of the community turned their zealous attention. To understand the history of Boston during the period included between the dates placed at the head of this chapter, it is necessary, if we wish to set in strong relief the characteristic features of the time, and not to wander in a tangled maze of valueless details, to study the fortunes of the ruling political party in the town. In that party, or in opposition to it, we must sooner or later meet with every man of importance; in their contests we must deal with every question which affected the interests of the town as well as those of the State or Nation; and thus we cannot fail to comprehend the general character of the life and society of that day and generation.

The peace of 1782 found Boston shorn of many of the attributes which had made her the first among the towns of the English colonies in America. The population, which before the war had numbered nearly twenty thousand, sank at the time of the siege to six thousand, comprising only those absolutely unable to get away; and when peace came it had risen to but little over twelve thousand. Military occupation, pestilence, and the flight of the Tory party had done their work, and had more than decimated the people. Commerce, the main support of the inhabitants, suffered severely in the war, and had been only partially replaced by the uncertain successes of the privateers. The young men had been drawn away to the army; both State and Confederacy were practically bankrupt; and the disorganization consequent upon seven years of civil war was great and disastrous. Boston was brought face to face with this gloomy condition of her affairs when the long strain of the Revolution was removed by the Treaty of Paris, and her people, with characteristic energy, set to work at once to remedy their misfortunes. Again the harbor was whitened with the sails of merchant ships, once more the trades began to flourish with their old activity in shop and ship-yard,[2] and the old bustle and movement were seen anew in the streets; but there was much weary work to be done before the ravages of war could be repaired. Ten years elapsed before the population reached the point at which it stood prior to the Revolution; and in that decade both town and State had much to endure in settling the legacies always bequeathed to a community by civil strife. The adjustment of social, financial, and political balances, after such a wrenching of the body politic, was a slow and in some respects a harsh and trying process, and many years passed before a condition of stable equilibrium was again attained.

The mere fact of revolution implies, of course, a rearrangement of classes in any community to a greater or less extent. In the provincial times, although the political system and theory of Massachusetts were demo-

[1] [See Mr. H. A. Hill's chapter in Vol. IV. — Ed.]

[2] [See the chapter on "Industries" in Vol. IV. — Ed.]

cratic, there was a vigorous and powerful aristocracy holding all the appointed and many of the elective offices, and recognized as leaders in public affairs. As a rule, this provincial aristocracy, which had its headquarters in Boston, was strongly in sympathy with the Crown, and abandoned the country on the success of the Patriots, either in the great flight which took place when Howe evacuated Boston, or singly, when opportunity offered. Their estates were confiscated, and they themselves took refuge for the most part in the northern provinces, and sometimes in England; but wherever they were their loyalty was remembered, and they were aided by the English Government.[1] Here and there exceptions to this rule could, of course, be found,—as notably in the case of John Hancock and the Quincys; although even in the latter family of Patriots one distinguished member was a Tory, and went into exile in consequence.[2] There were a few others of this class who, while their sympathies were with England, managed to preserve a judicious neutrality, and remained in their native town, suspected by many, and stripped of all political power, but retaining their social position, and after many years regaining some portion of their influence. These remnants of the provincial aristocracy were at best but trifling, and new men had ample openings in the great gaps which war had made. The new men, of course, came; and equally, of course, they were the leaders of the successful Revolution. They were not, however, as commonly happens in such cases, drawn from the class immediately below that which had been overthrown. The country aristocracy, the squires and gentry of the small towns and villages, unlike their brethren of the capital, had been as a rule on the side of resistance to England, and had furnished most of the Revolutionary leaders. When their battle was won, many of them came up from their counties and settled in Boston, occupying the places of their banished opponents, and not infrequently by cheap purchases becoming possessors of the confiscated homes of the exiles. To this class, which, to borrow a very famous name, may be not inaptly styled the Country party, belonged, for example, the Adamses and Fisher Ames from Norfolk, the Prescotts from Middlesex, and the Sullivans from New Hampshire; while from Essex, most prolific of all, came the Parsonses, Pickerings, Lees, Jacksons, Cabots, Lowells, Grays, and Elbridge Gerry. These men and their families rapidly filled the places left vacant in society by the old supporters of the Crown, and, of course, already possessed the political power which they had gained by the victories of the Revolution. This new aristocracy maintained for many years the ascendancy in public affairs which had been held by their predecessors, but their tenure, weakened by the ideas developed in the Revolution, was more precarious; and although they dictated the policy of the State for nearly half a century, their power as a class broke down and disappeared before the rapid rise and spread of democracy during the lifetime of the next generation.

[1] [See Editorial Notes at the end of Mr. Scudder's chapter in this volume. — Ed.]

[2] [This was Samuel Quincy, Solicitor-General of the Province, a brother of Josiah Quincy, Jr., the Patriot. There is a biography of him in the appendix to *Curwen's Journal*. — Ed.]

The Patriot party — the Whigs of the Revolution — triumphed so completely by the result of the war that they found themselves not only masters of the field in 1782, but absolutely unopposed. In their own num-



JOHN ADAMS.[1]

bers future party divisions were in due time formed, and we can detect the germ of those divisions, even before the peace, in the Constitutional Convention which met at Boston in 1780.[2] The old chiefs as a rule leaned, as

[1] [This cut, made by the kind permission of the Hon. Charles Francis Adams, follows Stuart's portrait of the old statesman, taken in 1825, a year before his death, in his eighty-ninth year. See Mason's *Stuart*, p. 125. A portrait by Copley, showing him in court dress, painted in 1783, was given to Harvard College in 1828 by W. N. Boylston, is engraved in Adams's *Works*, vol. v., and hangs in Memorial Hall, where is another by J. Trumbull, given by Andrew Cragie in 1794. Another by Stuart is owned by Mr. T. Jefferson Coolidge, of Boston. There is in the Historical Society's cabinet a copy, by Stuart Newton, of Gilbert Stuart's portrait. See *Proceedings*, April, 1862, p. 3. The *Boston Magazine*, February, 1784, has a full-face portrait of John Adams, engraved by J. Norman. — Ed.]

[2] [See Mr. Charles Deane's valuable paper on the connection of Judge Lowell with the Declaration of Rights, in *Mass. Hist. Soc. Proc.*,

might be expected, to popular and democratic views; but what was more important, they belonged, like Sam Adams, to the class of minds which can destroy or defend, but which cannot construct. The younger leaders, on the other hand, belonged to the coming period of reconstruction, when a new fabric of politics and society was to be built up, and were more conservative and less democratic than those whom they had followed in the conflict with England. The first serious division of opinion in the Patriot party grew out of the difficulties engendered by the war. The heaviest burdens were financial. Debts, public and private, weighed severely upon the State, and upon nearly every member of the community. General insolvency, in fact, prevailed. The war had drained the country of specie; the Continental paper was worthless, and that of the State not much better. The scarcity of a decent circulating medium was so great that payments in kind were legalized. To thinking men it was already obvious that a strong central government, stability, order in the public finances, and a vigorous administration, both State and National, were essential to drag the country out of the chaos of floating debts, and knit once more the political bonds almost dissolved by war. To effect such results was no easy matter. Society and public opinion had been grievously shaken, and old habits had been loosened and weakened. As always happens in times of distress and depression, there were many among the more ignorant of the community who mistook effect for cause. They were poor and in debt; and in the means adopted by their creditors to collect debts through the usual legal machinery, they believed they saw the source of their sufferings. The popular feeling of discontent in the western part of the State, therefore, began as early as 1782 to express itself in resistance to law and to the courts. Matters went on from bad to worse; violence and force became more and more common; the power of the State was crippled; and at last it all culminated in the insurrection known in our history as Shays' Rebellion, which not only threatened the existence of the Commonwealth, but shook to its foundations the unstable fabric of the Confederacy. While the storm was gathering, John Hancock, the popular hero and governor, not fancying the prospect opening before the State, and the consequent difficulties and dangers likely to beset the chief magistrate, took himself out of the way, and the younger and more conservative element in politics elected James Bowdoin in his stead. It was a fortunate choice in every way. Bowdoin was a wise, firm, courageous man, perfectly ready to sacrifice popularity, if need be, to the public good. He was warmly supported in Boston, as the principles and objects of Shays and his followers were peculiarly obnoxious to a business community. The alarm in the town was very great, for it looked as if their contest for freedom was about to result in anarchy. The young men came forward, armed themselves, and volunteered for service; but the Governor's firmness was all that was needed. General Lincoln, at the head of the mili-

April, 1874, p. 299; also Governor Bullock's admirable paper in the *Amer. Antiq. Soc. Proc.*, April 27, 1881. — Ed.]

tia, easily crushed the feeble mob gathered by Shays, whose followers were entirely dispersed.[1] Nevertheless the rioters represented, although in a very extreme fashion, the general sentiment of the State, demoralized and shaken by civil war, as was shown by the almost criminal delay of the lower branch of the Legislature in sustaining the Governor in his efforts to maintain order, and by their reluctance to declare the insurgents in rebellion,—a step forced upon them by the vigor of the Governor and Senate. This unhappy condition of public opinion was still more strongly manifested at the next election. The issue was made up between pardon and sympathy for the rebels on the one side and just and salutary punishment on the other. The conservative party, in favor of the latter course, put forward Bowdoin; while Hancock, who had been under shelter, now came forward once more to catch the popular support as the advocate of mercy, which another better and braver man had alone earned the right to dispense. Hancock had chosen his time well. Popular feeling in the country districts was with the insurgents, and Bowdoin was defeated; although Boston, now thoroughly in the hands of the younger and more conservative party, strongly sustained him. Thus the new party of order and reconstruction started in Boston, which continued to be its headquarters; and gradually extending its influence, first through the eastern towns and then to the west, came finally to control the State.

The Shays Rebellion did more, however, than decide the elections in Massachusetts. It was without doubt an efficient cause in promoting the Constitutional Convention at Philadelphia, and in frightening the decrepit and obstructive Congress of the Confederation. The adoption of the Constitution, submitted by the delegates who met in Philadelphia, was an event of national as well as local importance, for the adhesion of the great State of Massachusetts was essential to success. Boston was the scene of the protracted struggle in the Convention which was held to consider this

[1] [The story of this insurrection enters into the substance of all histories of Massachusetts, but it has been amply told by G. R. Minot, in his



monograph, *Insurrections in Massachusetts in* 1786, published in 1788, and in a second edition in 1810; and there are numerous references to contemporary and other authorities in a chapter on it in Barry's *Massachusetts*, iii. ch. 6. See also Sargent's *Dealings with the Dead*, No. 29, and Holland's *Western Massachusetts*. There is a volume in the *Massachusetts Archives* on Shays' Insurrection. A company of light infantry was raised in Boston to act against the insurgents, Harrison Gray Otis being made captain, with Thomas Russell and John Gray as lieutenants. Boston liberally supplied the means by which, in January, General Lincoln was put in command of forty-four hundred men, and with these he marched from Roxbury on the twenty-first.

When Bowdoin went to Cambridge to review Brooks's troops, being then about fifty-eight years old, he is described as wearing a gray wig, cocked hat, white broadcloth coat and waistcoat, red small-clothes, and



black silk stockings. Sullivan's *Public Men*, letter ii. *Massachusetts Revolutionary Rolls*, ix. contains certificates of service in Shays' Rebellion. — Ed.]

momentous question, first in Brattle-Street Church, still bearing the marks of Washington's cannon, and later in the State House, and later still in the meeting-house in Long Lane.[1] The town was, of course, deeply interested in the result, and strongly in favor of the Constitution; but the details of the long conflict which ended in its adoption do not immediately concern this history. The conservative elements, which had

JAMES BOWDOIN.[2]

begun to take a party shape in the Shays Rebellion, developed into a strong and homogeneous body in favor of the Constitution. They had an arduous battle to fight, and they fought it well. Against them were arrayed all the sympathizers with the Shays Rebellion, besides many who had actually taken part in it, and who, having tasted the sweets of incipient anarchy, were averse to anything like strong government. There can be no

[1] [See Vol. II. p. 513. — Ed.]

[2] [This cut follows a miniature by Copley, painted about 1770, now owned by the Hon. Robert C. Winthrop, Bowdoin's descendant. See Perkins's *Copley's Life and Paintings*, p. 37. There is a profile of Bowdoin in the *Massachusetts Magazine*, January, 1791. Mr. Winthrop delivered at Bowdoin College an excellent address on Bowdoin's life and character, which is contained in his *Speeches* and in a later volume on *Bowdoin, Franklin, and Washington*, from the same gentleman. A privately printed edition, with additions and notes of the *Life and Services of Bowdoin*, bears date 1876.

doubt that at the outset public feeling and a majority of the Convention were against the Constitution; and, moreover, the great leaders of the Revolutionary period, Hancock and Adams, were lukewarm. By ability in debate, by perseverance, by managing and flattering Hancock,[1] these difficulties were gradually overcome; while to gain the earnest and active support of Adams, the popular sentiment of Boston was invoked. The mechanics of the town, under the lead of Paul Revere, held a great meeting at the Green-Dragon Tavern,[2] on Union Street, and passed resolutions in favor of the Constitution. This was the voice of an oracle to which Adams had often appealed in trying times, and its utterance now weighed with him, and changed cool and critical approval to active support. Perhaps it decided the fate of the Constitution; for the great influence of Adams may well have counted for much in a close majority of only nineteen votes.

The adoption of the Constitution by Massachusetts was a source of great satisfaction to Boston,[3] and was celebrated with great rejoicing. After the ratification the members of the Convention dined together, toasts were drunk, and the asperities of debate were forgotten for the moment in a general sense of pleasure and relief. The next day a procession paraded the streets. First came the representatives of agriculture; then the trades; then the "Ship Federal Constitution," drawn by thirteen horses, with a crew of thirteen men; then captains and seamen of merchant-vessels; and finally more trades and the militia companies. The procession visited the houses of the Boston delegates, fired salutes in front of the State House, while the proceedings concluded with another great public dinner. In the evening an old long-boat, named "The Old Confederation," was borne by another procession to the Common, and there burned amid the shouts of the people.

With intense interest Boston watched the adoption of the Constitution by one State after another; and we can see, in the newspapers, the rapid development of the new party of reconstruction, the friends of the Constitution, now known as Federalists, and the corresponding increase of bitterness toward all who attempted to thwart a measure believed, in Boston at least, to involve the future existence of the nation. The party which thus took shape in the debates of the Constitutional Convention, and was solidified and strengthened by victory, bent all its energies to selecting senators and representatives who were well known to be strong friends of

[1] [Referring to Hancock's proposition of amendments, which perhaps saved the Constitution in the Convention, Rufus King writes to General Knox: "Hancock will hereafter receive the universal support of Bowdoin's friends; and we tell him that if Virginia does not unite, which is problematical, that he is considered as the only fair candidate for President." We all know the sequel: Virginia did unite; and the Massachusetts Governor had a very bad attack of gout when the Virginian President visited Boston the next year. See Amory's *James Sullivan*, i. 223. — Ed.]

[2] [See Vol. II. p. v. — Ed.]

[3] [The debates of this convention, edited by B. K. Peirce and Charles Hale, were published by the State in 1856. The "conciliatory resolutions" introduced by Hancock were written by Parsons (*Memoir of Theophilus Parsons*, 70), though their authorship has been claimed for James Sullivan, and perhaps for others. Some of Dr. Belknap's minutes of the debates are printed in *Mass. Hist. Soc. Proc.*, March, 1858, p. 296. See Mr. Cummings's chapter in this volume for an account of Benjamin Russell's reports. — Ed.]

the new scheme. Flushed with their first triumph, the Federalists were generally successful, and both senators were tried friends of the Constitution; but their most signal victory was in the Boston District,[1] where they elected Fisher Ames,[2] the young and eloquent champion of the Constitution, over Sam Adams, the veteran of the Revolution, the idol of the town, but now suspected of coolness toward the great instrument which was destined to be the corner-stone of a nation. The defeat of Adams by Ames marked Boston as the great centre of New England Federalism.

The pleasure excited in Boston by the successful establishment of the new government found an opportunity for expression when Washington, — venerated and beloved, the mainstay of the Union, as he had been of the Revolution, — made his visit to Massachusetts in the autumn of 1789. The President, accompanied by the Vice-President, John Adams, was received by the authorities on the outskirts of the town;[3] and, having been presented with an address, rode through the streets on a fine white horse, escorted by a long procession,[4] civil and military, and greeted on all sides by the applause of a dense crowd. On arriving at the State House he was conducted to a platform thrown out on the west side of the building,

[1] [On April 12, John Adams, on his way to New York to become the first Vice-President under the new Constitution, was escorted into Boston from Roxbury by a troop of horse. Amid the ringing of bells he was carried to Governor Hancock's, where he lunched with the dignitaries; and then, amid another firing of cannon, he went on his journey. — Ed.]

[2] [The son of Fisher Ames, Seth Ames, Esq., in making in 1854 a new edition of the works, speeches, and correspondence of his father, concluded that as his own recollections were of no account, — he was but three years old at his father's death, — he could not do better by way of introduction than to give the kindly memoir by Dr. Kirkland, and let the letters, then first printed, stand as a supplement to it. In 1871 a new contribution to the subject appeared in a volume of Ames's *Speeches in Congress*, 1789–1796, edited by Pelham W. Ames, including five speeches not given in his works. Fisher Ames studied in the office of William Tudor, in Boston, and though his residence in the town was not a long one, he represented it as part of the Suffolk District in the First Congress. It was he, too, when Washington died, who was selected to pronounce a eulogy before the Legislature in Boston. On his own death, in 1808, his body was brought to Boston, that Samuel Dexter might pronounce an oration over it. Stuart's portrait of Ames is owned by Mrs. John E. Lodge, of Boston, descending to her from her grandfather, George Cabot, Ames's friend. The likeness in Memorial Hall, Cambridge, is a copy, not accounted good, by Stuart, purchased of him in 1810. Mason's *Stuart*, p. 127. A good engraving, by T. Kelley, of Stuart's Fisher Ames appeared in the *Boston Monthly Magazine*, January, 1826. He is the subject of some further biographical details in Loring's *Hundred Boston Orators*, p. 296. — Ed.]

[3] [As Washington approached Boston he was met by a troop of horse from Cambridge, and in this town he tarried an hour, to visit the mansion which had been his headquarters at the time of the siege. His chariot was now changed for the saddle, and at the village green General Brooks saluted him with a thousand militia in line. — Ed.]

[4] [The procession was headed by the band of the French fleet then in the harbor, which at the same time united its salvos with those of the Castle and the parading artillery companies; while Colonel Bradford, with five companies of city troops, took the lead. It will be remembered that before the start was made Washington was kept waiting in the cold while an unseemly altercation took place between the selectmen and Sheriff Henderson, who was present representing the Governor, and assumed to control the order of the march. The sheriff threatened "to make a hole" through some of the town's officers, and they waived their rights. They later, Dec. 12, 1789, wrote an indignant letter to Hancock, who replied by sending Henderson's version of the affair, in which he claimed to have acted "according to his Excellency's orders," which Hancock did not gainsay; and to this the selectmen returned a temperate reply that they should not presume to altercate with his Excellency, etc. The letters are in the Charity Building collection. — Ed.]

and arranged, as we are informed, "to exhibit in a strong light the *Man of the People.*" As Washington stood forth in all his simple majesty,



WASHINGTON.[1]

cheers rang out, and an ode was sung in his honor by singers placed in a triumphal arch close by. After this the procession broke up, and then for

[1] [This cut follows the well known Boston Athenæum head by Stuart, now in the Art Museum. Washington gave the artist sittings in the spring of 1796; it was never finished. This picture was bought, after Stuart's death, of his widow, and given to the Athenæum, which also owns the companion head of Mrs. Washington, and a considerable portion of Washington's library. See Mason's *Gilbert Stuart*, 103, for a photogravure of the original canvas. It is from this that Stuart's later pictures of Washington were reproduced. Replicas of Stuart's Washington, varying sometimes in accessories, are owned in Boston: one by Chief-Justice Gray, formerly the property of the Pinckney family, of South Carolina; one painted for Jonathan Mason, now owned by Mrs. William Appleton; a copy of the Athenæum head, made in 1810 for Josiah Quincy, now at Quincy; one belonging to the Hon. R. C. Winthrop, formerly owned by the MacDonald family; one which was in a series of the first five presidents of the United States, bought of Col George Gibbs's estate by Mr. T. Jefferson Coolidge. These items are taken from a long

several days there was a round of dinners and state visits. Washington lived during his stay in Boston on the corner of Tremont and Court streets, where a small and lofty tablet still commemorates his sojourn. The most amusing incident of his visit, and the one most characteristic both of the men and the times, was the little conflict between him and John Hancock on a point of etiquette. Hancock, as the chief officer of what he esteemed a sovereign State, undertook to regard Washington as a sort of foreign potentate, who was bound to pay the first visit to the ruler of the Commonwealth in which he found himself; while Washington took the view that he was the superior officer of the Governor of Massachusetts, and that, as the head of the Union, Hancock was bound to visit him first. Washington's sense of dignity, and of what was due to his position, had often been exemplified, and the Governor's vanity and State sovereignty were no match for it. Hancock prudently made the gout an excuse for giving way; and having as fine a sense as the first Pitt of the theatrical properties of his malady, appeared at Washington's door, swathed in flannel, and was borne on men's shoulders to the President's apartments. After this all went well, and Washington's visit not only drew out the really vigorous personal loyalty of the people, but still further kindled the en-

enumeration of copies, by himself, of Stuart's likenesses of Washington given by Mr. Mason.

A silhouette of Washington, taken during the last years of his presidency, is now preserved in the Mass. Hist. Society's cabinet, of which a heliotype is given in their *Proceedings*, December, 1873.

The Historical Society also owns a copy of C. W. Peale's full-length of Washington, following the copy owned by the Earl of Albemarle; while other repetitions of Peale's work are at present in the Smithsonian Institution, at Versailles, and at the College of New Jersey. *Mass. Hist. Soc. Proc.*, 1873-75, pp. 324, 350, 366, 375-77.

In 1851 there was published in Boston a profile likeness of Washington, purporting to have been taken in Boston, in 1776, by one Fullerton. A pen-and-ink sketch, marked J. Hiller, 1794, mentioned in *Mass. Hist. Soc. Proc.*, 1874, p. 243, is thought to have been drawn from this. It is thought that a miniature likeness of Washington, in plaster, mentioned as belonging to Mr. Melvin Lord, in *Mass. Hist. Soc. Proc.*, February, 1874, p. 254, may have been taken in Boston or Cambridge at the time of the siege.

During Washington's visit to Boston in 1789, Gullagher, the painter, stealthily made a likeness of the General, while he was at chapel; but a day or two later, following him to Portsmouth, he made the likeness which is engraved in the *Mass. Hist. Soc. Proc.*, March, 1858, p. 309. The artist sold his picture in Boston, by a raffle, and it finally came into the possession of Dr. Belknap. Harvard College had given its first doctorate of laws to Washington in 1776; and at the request of its corporation his likeness was painted in 1790 by Edward Savage, of which there is an engraving by the artist, published in 1793. The painting hangs in Memorial Hall.

Christ Church contains the first monument ever erected to his memory. It is a bust in marble, of which photographs have recently been taken by Notman at the instance of Mr. John C. Ropes. Chantrey's statue of Washington, which stands in the State House, was erected in 1828, at a cost of $15,000. In this building are to be seen fac-similes of the monumental stones erected in the church at Brington, Northamptonshire, to the memory of members of the Washington family, who were long supposed to be ancestors of George Washington, the reproductions having been given by Earl Spencer to Charles Sumner, and by him to the State, in 1861. Later investigations of Colonel Joseph L. Chester have rendered it almost certain that the American family did not spring from this stock. See *Herald and Genealogist*, London, and *Heraldic Journal*, Boston, 1866. The equestrian statue in the Public Garden, modelled by Thomas Ball, of which an engraving is given in Vol. IV. was not placed in position till 1869, though begun some years earlier.

It was after this visit of the General, in 1789, that the main thoroughfare into the town from Roxbury was named for him; but the various names that designated this street north of Dover Street, were not displaced, and the name applied to the whole length of it, till 1824. — Ed.]

thusiasm of Boston and of New England for the Union, and consequently strengthened the hands of the Federalists.[1]

The assumption of the State debts by the new Federal government did much to relieve the financial burdens of Massachusetts; and this, combined with the sense of stability in public affairs, aroused the spirit of enterprise everywhere, so that Boston became the centre of many great schemes for public improvements, most of which came to nothing, although they served, nevertheless, to encourage the business of the town. The population had



THE TRIUMPHAL ARCH.[2]

again reached the number which it had before the Revolution, and the new era to which the war had been a prelude was fairly begun. As if to mark the change which had set in, one of the most conspicuous characters of the old period passed away at this time, by the death of John Hancock.[3] There have been but few men in history who have achieved so much fame, and whose names are so familiar, who at the same time really did so little, and left so slight a trace of personal influence upon the times in which they lived, as John Hancock. He was valuable chiefly from his pictur-

[1] [Recollections of Washington's visit, by General W. H. Sumner, are printed in the *New England Historical and Genealogical Register*, April, 1854, and April, 1860, p. 161. See also Loring's *Hundred Boston Orators*, p. 114; Edward Everett's *Mount Vernon Papers*, 106. See the account of the musical accompaniments in the Hon. Robert C. Winthrop's *Speeches and Addresses*, 1852–1867, p. 330. Some explanations by Nathaniel Gorham upon the disturbance between Hancock and Washington, printed in Drake's *Landmarks of Middlesex*, p. 15, throw a light upon the matter more favorable to Hancock. — Ed.]

[2] [This is a fac-simile of the view of this triumphal arch, which appeared in the *Massachusetts Magazine*, January, 1790. The erection stretched with a triple arch across Washington Street, just north of Court Street. The inscription read: "To the man who unites all hearts." — Ed.]

[3] [Hancock died Oct. 8, 1793, and was buried in the Granary burying-ground. See Shurtleff, *Description of Boston*, p. 212. — Ed.]

esqueness. Everything about him is picturesque, from his bold, handsome signature,[1] which gave him an assured immortality, to his fine house which appears in the pictures of the day as the "Seat of His Excellency, John Hancock." His position, wealth, and name made him valuable to the real movers of the Revolution, when men of his stamp were almost without exception on the side of the Crown; and it was this which made such a man as Sam Adams cling to and advance him, and which gave him a factitious importance. Hancock was far from greatness; indeed it is to be feared that he was not much removed from being "the empty barrel," which is the epithet, tradition says, that the outspoken John Adams applied



to him.[2] And yet he had real value after all. He was the Alcibiades, in a certain way, of the rebellious little Puritan town; and his display and gorgeousness no doubt gratified the sober, hard-headed community which put him at its head and kept him there. He stands out with a fine show of lace and velvet and dramatic gout, a real aristocrat, shining and resplendent against the cold gray background of every-day life in the Boston of the days after the Revolution, when the gay official society of the Province had been swept away. At the side of his house he built a dining hall, where he could assemble fifty or sixty guests; and when his company was gathered he would be borne or wheeled in, and with easy grace de-

[1] [Few signatures are so well known as Hancock's; and, as it happens, that oftenest seen, attached to the Declaration of Independence and given in the text, is one of the boldest and finest of them all. Ordinarily his signature, though preserving some of the characteristics of that, lacked its steadiness and regularity of curve. That which is given in Mr. Scudder's chapter, and under his portrait in Vol. IV. p. 5, is more nearly an average one. The one annexed, taken from a writing of his college days, shows some of the possibilities of the later ones. — Ed.]



[2] [Yet see what John Adams says of him in *Works*, x. 259–261; and the grandson, Charles Francis Adams, not unfairly estimates the value of Hancock to his times in the brief memoir of him prepared in 1876, which is printed in the *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography*, i. 73. A favorable account is given in Sanderson's *Signers of the Declaration of Independence*, which has been by some attributed to John Adams; but see John Adams's *Works*, ii. 416. See also Tudor's *Life of Otis*, p. 261, and H. E. Scudder's chapter in the present volume. — Ed.]



THE HANCOCK HOUSE.[1]

light every one by his talk and finished manners. In society his pettiness, peevishness, and narrowness would vanish, and his true value as a brilliant

[1] [This cut follows a view of the house given in the *Massachusetts Magazine*, July, 1789; also given in heliotype in the *Evacuation Memorial*, p. 99 Another view of it, twenty years later or more, will be found in the view of upper Beacon Street, taken from the Common, in another part of the present volume; and a still later view (1825) is that in Snow's *Boston*, p. 325. Views of it as it appeared at a later day, when but a mere house-yard was left about it, are numerous. Hinton, *United States*, Boston, 1834, ii. 342; S. A. Drake's *Landmarks*, p. 339; S. G. Drake's *Boston*, p. 681; King's *Handbook of Boston*, p. 12; Lossing's *Field-book of the Revolution*, i. 507, etc.

In 1859 a strenuous effort was made in the State Legislature to secure the passage of a bill by which the Commonwealth should become the owner of the house, using it for the residence of its Governors, or for any other good purpose. The Governor had raised the question of its purchase in his message, and a committee with the Hon. Edward G. Parker at its head had recommended that $100,000 be appropriated for the purpose, and the heirs executed a bond to sell for that sum. This report was printed in the Boston newspapers, in February, 1859. The Hon. Charles W. Upham, March 17, 1859, made a strong appeal in the House of Representatives, in urging the claims of Hancock on the grateful recognition of the State, and this speech is reported in the *Boston Daily Advertiser*, March 24, 1859. The project failed; and finally, on Feb. 18, 1863, the land was sold to James M. Beebe and Gardner Brewer, for $125,000, who built for their own occupancy the two houses now standing on the site. The mansion was reserved for re-erection elsewhere; but this plan likewise miscarried, and it was at last pulled down and sold as old material. The knocker of the front door was given to Dr. O. W. Holmes, who put it on the door of the old Holmes house in Cambridge. *Mass. Hist. Soc. Proc.*, May, 1875, p. 38. There is a historical account, by Arthur Gilman, of the Hancock house and its founder, in the *Atlantic Monthly*, 1863, p. 692. The house was built in 1737, by Thomas Hancock (see Vol. II. p. 519, for his portrait), of whom there is an account by Alden Bradford, in *Hunt's Merchants' Magazine*, i. 346; and who, dying in 1764, left his mansion and the bulk of his estate to his nephew, John Hancock. See the genealogy in *N. E. Hist. and Geneal. Reg.* ix. 352. There is no trace of a grant to warrant the use of the arms borne by John Hancock. (*Heraldic Journal*, ii. 99.) For a time after he resigned the presidency of Congress, Hancock lived during the summer in Jamaica Plain, in a cottage which stood just beyond the present residence of Mr. Moses Williams. The story goes that he gave up his residence there because his neighbor, William Gordon, the historical writer, who was one of the overseers of Harvard College, greatly offended Hancock by his severe strictures on Hancock's neglect to settle his accounts as treasurer of that institution. — Ed.]

and picturesque figure would come out. His death was but one of the incidents which, as the old century hastened to its close, marked the change which had fairly come. The old simplicity, as well as the old stateliness and pomp, were alike slipping away. Those were the days when the gentry lived in large houses, enclosed by handsome gardens, and amused themselves with card parties, dancing parties, and weddings; when there were no theatres, and nothing in the way of relaxation except these little social festivities. But the enemy was at the gates, — a great, hurrying, successful, driving democracy. Brick blocks threatened the gardens; the theatre came, despite the august mandate of Governor Hancock;[1] the elaborate and stately dress of the eighteenth century began to be pushed aside, first for grotesque and then for plainer fashions;[2] the little interests of provincial days began to wane; Unitarianism sapped the foundations of the stout old church of Winthrop and Cotton;[3] and the eager zest for intellectual excitement poured itself into business and politics, the only channels then open, giving to the latter an intensity hardly to be appreciated in days when mental resources are as numerous as they then were few. Boston was feeling the effects of the revolution which had been wrought by the War for Independence, the first act of the mighty revolutionary drama just then reopening in Paris.

To this change and progress in society and in habits of life the French Revolution gave of course a powerful impetus.[4] The tidings from Paris were received in this country at first with a universal burst of exultation, which found as strong expression in Boston as anywhere. The success of Dumouriez was the occasion of a great demonstration. A liberty pole was raised,[5] an ox roasted, and bread and wine distributed in State Street; while Sam Adams, who had succeeded his old companion as Governor, presided, with the French Consul, at a great civic banquet in Faneuil Hall. The follies of the Parisian mob were rapidly adopted; "Liberty and Equality" was stamped on children's cakes; and the sober merchants and mechanics of Boston began to address each other as "citizen" Brown, and "citizen" Smith. The ridiculous side of all this business would soon have made itself felt among a people whose sense of humor was one of their strongest characteristics; but when the farce became tragedy, and freedom was baptized in torrents of blood, and the gentle, timid, stupid king, known to Americans only as a kind friend, was brought to the block, the enthusiasm rapidly subsided.[6] Every one knows how the affairs of France were dragged into our national politics for party purposes, with Democratic societies and Jacobin clubs in their train, and the bitterness which came

[1] [See the chapter on "The Drama," by Colonel Clapp, in Vol. IV. — Ed.]

[2] [See Mr. J. P. Quincy's chapter in Vol. IV. — Ed.]

[3] [See Dr. Peabody's chapter in the present volume. — Ed.]

[4] [See its effect on the press, noted in Mr. Cummings's chapter in this volume — Ed.]

[5] [The pole, sixty feet high, was raised, Jan. 24, 1793, in the area then named, and since called, Liberty Square. The ox was roasted on Copp's Hill, and the viands were served on tables in State Street, stretching from the Old State House to near Kilby Street. — Ed.]

[6] [See Mr. J. P. Quincy's chapter in Vol. IV. p. 11. — Ed.]

from them; but all this gained little foothold in Boston, where the insults of Genet roused general indignation, and the attitude of Washington toward the insolent Frenchman found hearty support. But fidelity to Washington and to the Federalist party was about to encounter a much severer strain. The war with England was so recent that it was hazardous to make any treaty with that country, and to carry through such a treaty as was actually made was a task for which Washington alone was capable. The Jay treaty, — which even Hamilton is said to have called, in the first moment of irritation, "an old woman's treaty" on the one side; and which Charles Fox, with all his liberalism, thought unfavorable to England on the other, — was received in America with a cry of rage so general that it seemed universal. In Boston a popular meeting[1] was held, and Democratic leaders indulged in vehement and acceptable denunciation. Riots broke out of a rather ugly character, which Governor Adams, blinded by prejudice, refused to repress;[2] and the excellent Mr. Jay was hung and burned in effigy, to the perfect satisfaction of the mob. The Federalists were stunned. Many of them openly condemned the treaty, while only the very coolest heads among them believed in sustaining the administration. Gradually, however, the leaders rallied. The Boston Chamber of Commerce passed resolutions in support of the President; reaction began; the stern, calm replies of Washington checked the tide of angry passion, and men at last began to see, especially in a business community, that the treaty, even if not the best possible, was necessary and valuable, and that the fortunes of the young nation could not be entangled with those of the mad French Republic. Boston was once more Federalist, and the stormy gust of anger had blown over.[3]

The growth of the Federalist party was shown when Sam Adams retired from public life, by the choice of Increase Sumner[4] as his successor. Governor Sumner was an ardent supporter of John Adams, then just beginning his eventful administration, and the troubles with France which ensued awakened deep indignation in Boston. Sumner's course drew out the most violent attacks, but he was re-elected by an overwhelming majority. The fortunes of the Feder-



[1] [At a town-meeting convened in Boston to consider it but one defender of it spoke. The selectmen transmitted to the President their Resolutions of disapproval, and drew from Washington a dignified reply. Sullivan's *Public Men*, p. 96. See further, on the opposition to Jay's treaty in Boston, in Loring's *Hundred Boston Orators*, p. 307. Harrison Gray Otis at this time made his first political speech. — Ed.]

[2] Wells's *Life of S. Adams*, iii. 351.

[3] [It was the masterly speech of Fisher Ames which carried the House of Representatives into measures sustaining it. This, the most famous of his speeches, is in his *Works*, and in the later *Speeches*, where an interesting note on it is prefixed. — Ed.]

[4] [Increase Sumner was born in Roxbury. See a memoir and genealogy in *N. E. Hist. and Geneal. Reg.*, April, 1854; also *Genealogy of the Sumner Family*, by W. S. Appleton, 1880; General W. H. Sumner's *History of East Boston*; and Bridgman's *Pilgrims of Boston*. — Ed.]

alists were at their highest point, and Moses Gill, the Lieut.-Governor, whom the death of Sumner left at the head of the government, was succeeded by Caleb Strong,[1] an ex-senator and one of the stanchest of Federalists. But even in the midst of their success the hour of their downfall was at hand. The administration of John Adams was torn with fierce internal dissension, and the President and the leaders in New England were hopelessly estranged. But although many of the chiefs in Boston drew off from the President, the clans stood by him and gave him the vote of Massachusetts. It proved a useless loyalty. The Federalists fell from power, and the new century opened with the accession of Jefferson, — an event which both leaders and followers in Boston had brought themselves to believe would be little else than the coming of a Marat or a Robespierre. It is hardly necessary to say that nothing of this sort happened, but that on the contrary a period of prosperity, for which the short-lived peace of Amiens opened the way, began, as unequalled as it was unexpected. This prosperity took the form of maritime commerce, and poured its riches into the lap of Boston, conspicuously among all the seaports.[2] At the same time, of course, all the country throve, although the great advance was most apparent among the merchants of Boston and New York and the seafaring population of New England. When men are making money and prospering it is not easy to awaken among them great political enthusiasm, nor is it easy to convince them that the administration under which they have succeeded is a bad one; but this was not the case with the leaders. Nothing could check their deadly hatred of Jefferson, which increased as they saw their own power decline and that of the Government wax strong. As the conviction forced itself upon their minds that the sceptre of government had passed finally to the South, before whom a divided North was helpless, they struggled vainly against fate; and the bitterness of party, so marked in the first decade of the century, found its origin in the years of Jefferson's first term, when peace and prosperity reigned throughout the country. Like the Whig party in England after the coalition, when they were called to face Pitt and his vast majorities, the thin ranks of the Federalists were still further weakened by the internal dissensions growing out of the sorry strifes of the Adams administration. These quarrels had been allayed by defeat; but they were only partially healed, and were soon to bear bitter fruit. Of all this Boston was of course the centre; and when the annexation of Louisiana roused the Federalists to desperation, it was in Boston that a meeting was to be held at which Hamilton should be present, and where the schemes of secession,





[1] [An engraving, after Stuart's portrait, will be found in *Mass. Hist. Soc. Proc.*, i. 290. — Ed.]

[2] [See Mr. H. A. Hill's chapter in Vol. IV. — Ed.]

which the New England leaders had been seriously discussing under their breath, should find expression and obtain a decision on their merits. The

HAMILTON.[1]

good sense of some of the leaders contributed with other causes to prevent the occurrence of this meeting; but had there been no other obstacle, the

[1] [This statue, cut in granite, designed by Rimmer, and given to the city in 1865 by Thomas Lee, stands in Commonwealth Avenue. It is inscribed, "Alexander Hamilton, born in the Island of Nevis, West Indies, 11 January, 1757: died in New York, 12 July, 1804." "Orator, writer, soldier, jurist, financier. Although his particular province was the treasury, his genius

death of Hamilton would have sufficed to cause postponement, if nothing else. The loss of that great man was peculiarly felt in Boston, where almost every man of note was one of his devoted followers, and where Federalism had struck its roots deeper and clung with a greater tenacity than anywhere else. In Boston Hamilton's death was deeply mourned. There the money — a large sum for those days — was raised to buy his lands and relieve the necessities of his family; and there the first statue of later times was raised to the great Secretary, commemorating alike his genius and the enduring and faithful Federalism of the old town in the years when the power of the Democracy seemed universal.

In this dark hour the Federalists were, indeed, nearly extinct, and when Massachusetts in 1804 gave her electoral vote to Jefferson it seemed as if the end could not be far distant. In fact the Federalist party would soon have perished utterly had it not been for the amazing blunders of Jefferson's second term, which gave the party a new lease of life and a vigorous and partially successful existence. This revival had not begun when an incident occurred, familiar to all who know the history of Boston, and which forcibly illustrates the violent party divisions of the town. This was the famous shooting of young Austin by Thomas Selfridge, — the former a Democrat, the latter a Federalist. The story of the death of Austin and the consequent trial of Selfridge are told in this History by another hand,[1] and do not need repetition here. The affair was made a party question; the newspapers were full of flings at Federalist murders and their impunity, and the talk, criticism, and invective connected with it give a vivid picture of the heated politics of Boston at that time. But the fervor of partisan feeling was soon to glow with a still fiercer heat, owing to the course of the world's history, in which the United States — the only neutral nation and still shackled by colonial feelings — was the foot-ball of the two great contending forces, Napoleon Bonaparte and the English Government. Into the stream of these mighty events, which are world-wide in their scope, the fortunes of Boston were strongly drawn. The renewal of hostilities by Napoleon had thrown the trade of all nations, and particularly that of England, the dominant power of the commercial world, into confusion. From this disorder the United States, as the only neutral with a strong merchant-marine, reaped a rich harvest, the fruits of which fell of course largely to New England, and therefore to Boston. It was the golden era of the American merchant-service, in which much of the best ability and the most daring enterprise were concentrated. Always alert and flushed with success, the New England sea-captains and merchants of Boston took quick advantage of the troubles of Europe to engross rapidly the carrying trade of the world,

pervaded the whole administration of Washington." The first marble statue ever erected in America is said to have been one of Hamilton, by Ball Hughes the Boston sculptor, which stood in the Merchants' Exchange in New York, and was destroyed in the fire of 1835. The original plaster model of it is now preserved in Albany. *Mag. of Amer. Hist.*, 1881, p. 466.

[1] [See the chapter in Vol. IV. on "The Bench and Bar," by Mr. John T. Morse, Jr. Dr. J. C. Warren was called to dress the wounds. See *Life of J. C. Warren*, i. 67. — Ed.]

and to heap up handsome fortunes from its enormous profits. We may see all this energy, courage, and enterprise depicted in the now almost forgotten voyages of Cleaveland and Delano, and learn how strong and true the genius for the sea is in the New England race.[1] But we can also see there the dark side of the picture; not merely the normal dangers and hardships, but the insult and pillage inflicted by French and English, and the helpless, manly wrath and indignation of the American seamen. Our success and prosperity after the outbreak of war in Europe was in truth too obvious, and soon aroused the unsleeping jealousy of England. Seizures began to be made by British cruisers; then came unwarrantable condemnations in the British admiralty courts; and then oppressive Orders in Council. The first sensation was one of angry pride and keen disappointment at interference with our apparently boundless sources of profit. Sharp remonstrances and resolutions went out from Boston to spur the lagging Executive. The Federalist leaders, who regarded England as the bulwark of civilization against the all-destroying French Revolution personified in Napoleon, were overborne; and, while reprobating these violent measures in secret, seemed about to lose their last hold upon the people, and were forced to see their Governor, Caleb Strong, replaced by a leading Democrat, James Sullivan.[2] They were properly helpless before the righteous indignation which blazed up more fiercely than ever when the English, not content with despoiling our merchant-vessels, fired upon the national flag flying from a national ship.[3] If Mr. Jefferson had at that supreme moment declared war and appealed to the country, he would have had the cordial support of the mass of the people not only in New England but in Boston itself; but it was not to be. The President faltered as the Federalists rallied and renewed their attack, fell back on his preposterous theories of commercial warfare, well suited to his timidity and love of shuffling, and forced the celebrated embargo through both Houses of Congress. The support of New England in the trying times which were at hand was lost to the administration, and the political game in that important section of the country was once more in the hands of those Federalist chiefs whose headquarters were at Boston. The Federalism of Boston had in fact remained steady in every trial, although there was a moment when Jefferson might have sapped its strength. It had been heard in Washington for years through the eloquent lips of



[1] [See Mr. H. A. Hill's chapter in Vol. IV. — Ed.]

[2] [Engravings of Stuart's portrait of James Sullivan can be found in T. C. Amory's *Life of Governor Sullivan*, and in *Mass. Hist. Soc. Proc.*, i. In 1834 it fell to the lot of William Sullivan, the son of Governor Sullivan, who had taken the opposite side in politics, to publish his *Public Men of the Revolution* and the period immediately following; and to make the motives and principles of the Federalists better known, he gave his book the greater latitude of familiar letters. In 1847 his son reissued it, much enlarged. William Sullivan was born in 1774. It was he who said: "Dignified civility, based upon self-respect, is a *gentleman's* weapon and defence." William Sullivan died in 1839. See Loring's *Hundred Boston Orators*, p. 317. — Ed.]

[3] [John Lowell in *Peace without Dishonor, War without Hope*, tried to allay the excitement. — Ed.]

Josiah Quincy,[1] whose voice now rose clearer and stronger than ever, trumpet-tongued against the embargo policy. The defection of John Quincy Adams on this same measure gave the town another strong and outspoken representative in the Senate in the person of James Lloyd, a leading merchant; and thus equipped in Washington, Boston faced the impending troubles.

So bitter was the feeling against England, so strong the sense of wounded national pride, that even the embargo was received in Boston at first with silent submission; but its operation told so severely upon both town and State that hostility to the administration rapidly deepened and strengthened. We can now hardly realize the effect of this measure upon Boston; but one fact lets in a flood of light. The tonnage of the United States in 1807 was, in round numbers, eight hundred and fifty thousand tons, and of this three hundred and ten thousand tons belonged to Massachusetts alone. The total cessation of commerce fell therefore upon Boston with blighting effect. Her merchant-ships rotted at the wharves, or were hauled up and dismantled. The busy ship-yards were still and silent, and all who gained their living by them were thrown out of work.[2] The fisheries were abandoned and agriculture was distressed. If in Philadelphia seamen marched in large bodies to the City Hall for relief, we can imagine what the condition of the seafaring population must have been in Boston. Ruin threatened the merchants, and poverty stared the laboring classes in the face. Gradually all this began to tell upon the temper of the people; riots and insurrections were feared by men of all parties; and the Federalists now found willing listeners when they pointed out to a people naturally brave and ready to fight, that the injuries inflicted by England were trifling in comparison with the total destruction of trade caused by their own Government; that the embargo had not as usual a limitation, but might become permanent; and that, however it might be disguised, the only nation really benefited by the embargo was the French. Slowly political power returned to the party constantly in opposition to Jefferson and all

[1] [Of Mr. Quincy his daughter says: "The desertion of his friends and the violence of his opponents were great elements of his success. He was a Federalist from principle, but too independent to join in party measures. When in Congress, some of the leading Federalists did not support him as he could have wished. They would not believe that their representative in Washington could have clearer views of the policy of the administration than they had, sitting in their insurance offices in Boston. . . . But he remained true to the Federalists, and they rewarded him in 1820 by striking his name from their list of senators without giving him the least intimation that they intended doing so. He felt this deeply, but he went to the caucus and spoke in favor of the ticket from which his name had been struck. This made him generally popular, and by being put into the House of Representatives he was brought before the people, and made speaker; and in the convention held on the separation of Maine, he became justly appreciated, and would have been run for governor the next year had he not accepted the office of municipal judge." Mr. Quincy's political conduct can be traced only too scantily in Edmund Quincy's *Life* of his father. Something of his Congressional career, with a fac-simile of "Josiah the First," a monarchical squib of which his opponents thought him a fit subject, is given in Lossing's *Field-book of the War of 1812*. The Congressional documents which he gathered during his service at Washington are now in the Public Library, and serve in part to make the collection of United States documents in that library what is presumably the best in existence. — Ed.]

[2] [See Mr. Hill's chapter in Vol. IV. — Ed.]

his works. Resistance began to crop out on all sides. Pickering attacked Governor Sullivan in a violent pamphlet; Samuel Dexter argued in court against the constitutionality of the embargo, and juries refused to convict for infractions of the hated law. The Federalists carried the Legislature, and passed resolutions denouncing the embargo and questioning its constitutionality; while the town of Boston instructed its representatives, in town-meeting, to resist the embargo in terms which recalled the days of Sam Adams and the Port Bill, and which induced John Randolph to remind Jefferson of the fate of Lord North in a former difficulty with the Puritan town. Then it was that John Quincy Adams thought treason and secession were afoot in Boston, and warned the administration of its peril. He was mistaken as to the extent of the danger, for there was no treason, and nothing worse than ominous whisperings of secession. The ripeness of the times and of the public in Boston for desperate measures was sufficient to excite such suspicions; but the Federalists did not aim at violence. In the state of society then existing, in the opportunity offered, and in the condition of the times, it is a matter of wonder that passions were so controlled; for it is not easy to appreciate now the mental concentration in that day and generation. There was no art, no literature, no science; the only great branch of business was laid low by the embargo; there were none of the thousand and one interests which now divide and absorb our energy and activity. Absolutely the only source of intellectual excitement was politics; and to this were confined the mental forces of a small, vigorous, cultivated, and aristocratic society, which flung itself into politics with its whole heart and soul. They were a convivial race, these Federalist leaders in Boston, and were wont to dine together at three o'clock; and at five, when the ladies left the room, Madeira and politics flowed without stint until midnight and after. It is small wonder that their politics were heated, that ex-senators and governors bandied harsh words in the offices of State Street or demanded explanations in the newspapers, and that the traditional feuds and bitterness of 1808, although softened and apparently forgotten, have survived in Boston among those who inherit them even to the present day.

With matters in this state, the passage of the enforcing act aroused such anger, the attitude of New England became so menacing, that the Northern Democrats quailed; and led by such "pseudo Republicans" as Joseph Story, who were not ready to sacrifice their homes to Mr. Jefferson's theories, they repealed the embargo. There was a great sigh of relief; and when the Erskine arrangement was made, the sails of the merchant-ships again whitened the harbor of Boston. The more reasonable policy of Mr. Madison was only temporary, however, in its effects, and was soon replaced by vacillation and by labyrinthine complications, into which it is unnecessary to enter. The relaxation, however, sufficed to loosen the hold of the Federalists, and Governor Gore was replaced by Elbridge Gerry, whose administration was in itself enough to strengthen and give victory once

more to his opponents. He denounced in a message the publications of the Federal press, which were, indeed, vituperative and coarse to a high degree, especially in Boston; and he endeavored to bring in the power of the government to punish the aggressors. He also supported a plan of arranging election districts for partisan purposes, which was so bad, and at that time so unheard of, that it gave a new word to the language. All this enabled the Federalists to defeat him by a close vote, in which they were aided by the gathering clouds of conflict, which broke, June 18, 1812, in Mr. Madison's declaration of war against England.[1]



The preceding years of mercantile restrictions had not only hardened and embittered the Federalist leaders, but had estranged the affections and worn out the temper of the people of Boston and of New England, ready enough to have supported a manly war policy in 1807. Their trade had been crippled, and had crumbled away before restrictive measures; the navy, which they chiefly manned and in which they believed, had been neglected, and they were in no humor for a war which put the finishing stroke to their commercial prosperity and activity for the time being. They were perfectly ready to sympathize with the protest of the Federalist representatives against the war, which they accepted with sullen dislike. Some of the Federalist leaders, notably Samuel Dexter,[2] conceiving that party differences should be buried in the presence of the enemy, seceded; but the Federalist majorities only grew with each election, while the belief that the war was needless and unjust, and was part and parcel of a general policy designed to ruin New England, spread daily and gained favor, carrying with it resistance to the administration. Into the controversies thus engendered it is not fitting to enter here, although they involved the fortunes of the town, for they were wide and far reaching, and chiefly concerned the Nation and States. The general sentiment in Boston seems to have settled down into a determination to do nothing in active support of offensive war, but resolutely to defend themselves against any foreign aggression. This they were called upon to do before the war closed.[3]

In 1814 the British policy of coast descents was extended to New England; scattered attacks were made, accompanied with burning and pillage, and the sails of English cruisers could daily be descried from Boston. The town was in a defenceless condition, the forts almost useless, and owing to the bitter quarrels with the administration no help had been given, or was

[1] [The news of this declaration reached Boston June 23, 1812, and the General Court, then in session, passed a vote, 406 to 240, disapproving of it. General Dearborn, as the United States officer commanding in Massachusetts, immediately made a requisition on Governor Strong for a body of the militia, eight companies of which were to be assigned to Boston; but the Governor refused to issue his proclamation for other ends than for the militia to be held in readiness for an emergency. — Ed.]

[2] [See Sargent's *Reminiscences of Dexter*, p. 77. — Ed.]

[3] [The events leading up to the war, and the part played in it by Boston, are detailed in General Palfrey's chapter in the present volume. — Ed.]

to be looked for, from the national government. The people of Boston and of Massachusetts had, however, no mind to endure the fate of Washington, and took prompt measures to protect themselves. The old forts were put in order, and a new one, Fort Strong, was thrown up on Noddle's Island, the work being rapidly performed by large bodies of ready volunteers under the direction of Loammi Baldwin, the engineer.[1] The militia were called out and stationed at the forts and at other points, ready to repel the expected attack, which fortunately never came.



THE GERRYMANDER.[2]

The exposed condition of the capital and of the other seaports however, and the neglect of the national government, did much to precipitate the crisis in the relations of State and Nation which had been long impending. In October the Legislature took steps toward concerted action among the New England States, with a view to defending themselves and forcing upon the administration the policy which they believed to be right. The result was the famous Hartford Convention, whose history belongs to the State and to New England, and not to Boston; although the feeling which led to that meeting

[1] [See Sumner's *East Boston*, p. 397. See also General Palfrey's chapter in the present volume. — Ed.]

[2] [In 1812, while Gerry was governor, the Democratic Legislature, in order to secure an increased representation of their party in the State Senate, districted the State in such a way that the shapes of the towns, forming such a district in Essex, brought out a territory of singular outline. This was indicated on a map which Russell, the editor of the *Centinel*, hung in his office. Stuart, the painter, observing it, added a head, wings, and claws, and exclaimed, "That will do for a salamander!" "Gerrymander!" said Russell, and the word became a proverb. An engraving of the fabulous beast was circulated later through the State on a broadside; and from one of these, preserved by the late Isaac P. Davis, the above cut, reduced from the original, seven inches high, is copied. But the process had accomplished its purpose, for while the Federalist majority in the State was sixteen hundred and two, the senate stood twenty-nine Democratic to eleven Federalist members. The next year produced a change; the Legislature became Federalist, and the old districts were restored. In the *Boston Gazette* for April 15, 1813, there is an "obituary notice" of the monster, with a cut representing him bent up in his coffin, and a sketch of his grave-stone: "Hatched, Feb. 11, 1812; died, April 5, 1813." Such is the story told by Buckingham in his *Reminiscences*. But other claimants have been put forward. The place is said to have been Colonel Israel Thorndike's house in Summer Street; the artist, Tisdale; the sponsor, Alsop. See Drake's *Landmarks of Middlesex*, p. 321. The reader will observe that the back line of the body in the large cut forms a profile caricature of Gerry, with the nose at Middleton. — Ed.]

found its fullest expression, perhaps, in the capital, where the newspapers, notably the *Daily Advertiser* then just started, urged strong measures and hinted at secession, and where the younger and more violent portion of the Federalist party was ripe for almost any step. The old and trusted leaders, however, threw themselves into the gap, determined to commit no overt act, but to check and control the movement at that time and leave the future to shape their subsequent course. Boston was represented at Hartford by George Cabot, who was chosen president of the convention, and by William Prescott, Harrison Gray Otis, and Timothy Bigelow. The result was as Mr. Quincy prophesied, — a "great pamphlet," and the committee sent to Washington reached there at the same time as the news of the Ghent treaty.



MASSACHUSETTS SIGNERS.[1]

Peace was received in Boston with ringing of bells and with every form of rejoicing, public and private;[2] and by none was it more welcomed than by the Federalists. The effect of the war on Boston was severe in the extreme. Not only

[1] [These are the signatures of the delegates from Massachusetts to the final report of the Hartford Convention. Of this number, Cabot was born in Salem, but latterly lived in Boston. Dane was a lawyer in Beverly; necessarily practising much in Boston, acquiring eminence; the founder of a law professorship at Cambridge, and the author of the ordinance of 1787. Otis was well known. Prescott was the father of the historian, and son of the Colonel Prescott of Bunker Hill fame. Bigelow had been a lawyer of Worcester County, speaker of the Massachusetts House of Representatives, and was the father-in-law of Abbott Lawrence. Thomas was a judge of probate in Plymouth County. Wilde, though born in Taunton, gained his early reputation as a lawyer in Maine, became a Justice of the Supreme Court of Massachusetts, and removed to Boston in 1831. Lyman and Bliss were important men in the Connecticut Valley. Longfellow, of Portland, was the father of the poet. Waldo was of Worcester.

Theodore Dwight's *History of the Hartford Convention* is in vindication of it. — Ed.]

[2] [See Mr. Josiah P. Quincy's chapter on "Social Life in Boston," in Vol. IV., and Mr. Edmund Quincy's *Life of Josiah Quincy*, p. 360. — Ed.]

was commerce, the great source of industry and wealth, wholly cut off, but the dependence upon England, now so difficult to realize, not only

GEORGE CABOT.[1]

for every manufactured article of luxury but for many of the necessities of life, had, by the cessation of intercourse, brought a sense of privation

[1] [No likeness of George Cabot of a maturer age exists, and the present cut follows a portrait owned by Colonel Henry Lee, kindly placed at my disposal, which represents him at sixteen. It is a pastel drawing. Mr. Lodge, the writer of this chapter, published in 1877 the *Life and Letters of George Cabot*, consisting chiefly of Letters, which had been preserved by Mr. Cabot's correspondents, with elucidatory introductions to the several chapters. Mr. Cabot had himself before his death destroyed almost all the papers remaining in his own hands. On the Hartford Convention, however, Mr. Lodge's excursus is prolonged and valuable; and in writing it he had the use of the Pickering manuscripts (over sixty volumes in all) in the Massachusetts Historical Society, and also the letters of Governor Strong. Mr. Lodge has also drawn somewhat from *Hamilton's Works*, and from Gibbs's *Administration of Washington and Adams*, and in a smaller degree from the *Life of Timothy Pickering* as continued by Mr. Upham. In turn Mr. Lodge's work has been drawn upon in part by Mr. Henry Adams in his *Documents relating to New England Federalism*, 1800–1815, which was published in 1877; nor should there be forgotten the *Memoir of John Quincy Adams*, published in 1858 by President Quincy, and the voluminous *Memoirs*, based largely upon Adams's Diary, which have been issued in twelve volumes by his

and loss into every household. But the war, and the policy of commercial restriction preceding it, had upon Boston a deep and lasting effect, which was hardly perceived at the moment, but which changed her business character, and has powerfully influenced her politics from that day to this. In the first years of the nineteenth century Boston was a great commercial centre and nothing else. Mr. Jefferson with his embargo and its kindred measures, and the War of 1812, shook the whole financial and economical system of the town. Commerce was crippled, at times almost extinguished, and comparatively large masses of capital were set loose and left idle, while at the same time an immense fund of enterprise and activity was unemployed. The result was to force all this capital and enterprise into other channels, where they had begun to flow very slowly. Manufactures received a great impetus; and the capital, which had been turned aside by the policy of the administration, did not, when peace came, revert to its old pursuits. From being a strong free-trade town, Boston became as vigorously protectionist before the first quarter of a century closed. Mr. Jefferson seems to have designed to reduce the commercial interest and weaken New England by his policy; he certainly regarded with complacency the fact that it would have that tendency. The result was that manufactures were stimulated; the progress of Boston was changed, not arrested; and New England industries were for years protected at the expense of his beloved South.

The conclusion of the war, and the revival of business in all directions closed the differences which had divided the country since the foundation of the government, and turned men's minds from the political issues of the past. It was the dawn of the so-called era of good feeling, the transition period in which old parties disappeared and new ones were developed. The Federalists of Massachusetts retained their power for many years, dexterously avoiding the rocks of religious controversy on which their party brethren of Connecticut were wrecked. They held the government by reason of past services solely, for the great political questions which had brought them forth and given them strength no longer existed. Gradually, however, they faded away; the old leaders in Boston and elsewhere retired from public life or were removed by death; and the century had hardly completed its second decade when the great party of Washington, really extinct for some years, vanished even in name from our history finally and irrevocably.

Almost coincident with the disappearance of the Federalist party was the change of municipal government in Boston from the town form to that of a city. The change had been agitated at various times from a very early period down to 1821, and in the next year the old town government came

son, Charles Francis Adams, between 1874 and 1877. The Life of Hamilton so far as it reacted upon the Federalism of Boston is not without importance; and the reader who has not the courage to compass the somewhat assuming and voluminous *Life* by John C. Hamilton may find progress easier in the *Life of Hamilton* as written by John T. Morse, Jr. in 1876. Of the part played by the press in the political movements in this period, see D. A. Goddard's *Newspapers and Newspaper Writers in New England*, 1787–1815, a pamphlet published in 1880. — ED.]

to an end. It had been the government of Winthrop and Cotton, of Adams and Franklin. It had defied George III. and Lord North, and its name had rung through two continents in the days when it faced the English Parliament alone and unterrified. It was the most famous municipal organization in America, and it passed away into history honored and regretted. The next chapter traces in detail the transformation which followed.

Henry Cabot Lodge

CHAPTER II.

BOSTON UNDER THE MAYORS, 1822–1880.

BY JAMES M. BUGBEE.

THE purpose of this chapter is to give some account of the local government of Boston since its organization under a city charter in the year 1822. The extent of the change in the administration of local affairs involved in the establishment of a municipal council in place of the town-meeting can hardly be appreciated without going back for a moment to consider the origin and development of what is known as the New England town-system. Most New Englanders cling to the belief that the system of local self-government which their Pilgrim and Puritan ancestors set up here was wholly original; that a new principle of government was introduced which had its natural culmination in the Declaration of Independence and the formation of the Federal Union: but the investigations of modern historians have made it clear that the early settlers of this country were governed largely by the traditions which had come down to them from their Teutonic ancestors. The form of government which they established had not its exact counterpart among any other people, but it was based on the ancient Anglo-Saxon township; and the new features which were introduced were only such as were necessitated or suggested by the peculiar circumstances in which the colonists were placed. They were wiser than many of their eulogists would make them. Had they struck out for themselves in an entirely new path, their subsequent development would have been wanting in those elements of conservatism and steadiness which have shown New England to be the lineal descendant of Old England.[1]

The charter of the Massachusetts Bay Company contained no express authority for the erection of town governments or the establishment of minor political divisions; and Sir Edmund Andros could say with truth, that in a legal point of view there was no such thing as a town in all New Eng-

[1] [See Vol. I. pp. 217, 427, 445, 454. This interesting subject of the origin of our town system, upon which so much new light has been thrown since the publication of Sir Henry Maine's *Village Communities*, is now undergoing more exact study at the hands of Dr. Herbert B. Adams, of Johns Hopkins University. See H. C. Lodge's *English Colonies in America*, p. 414, and *Harvard University Bulletin*, June 1, 1881, or vol. ii. 214. — ED.]

land. Boston was never formally incorporated as a town. The order of the Court of Assistants (Sept. 7, O. S. 1630), changing the name from Tri-mountain to Boston,[1] has been construed by the courts to be sufficient to entitle it from that time forward to all the privileges of a town; but no corporation was specifically established until 1822. Springing up in this way, outside of the formal scheme of government devised by the king, the line between the town governments and the colonial government could never be very clearly defined; and it may well be imagined that the former were continually encroaching upon the just and necessary powers of the latter.[2] Fortunately for the maintenance of local government, the colonial authority as represented by the General Court was composed of delegates from the towns; and therefore almost any exercise of authority on the part of the towns, which did not interfere directly with the operations of the general government, was permitted and indeed encouraged. The extent and variety of the powers exercised by the town of Boston in its early days go far beyond those exercised by the city of to-day. The conditions upon which strangers should be allowed to reside in the town,[3] the admission of new comers to the rights of citizenship,[4] the conditions upon which allotments of land should be made,[5] the prices of commodities, the rates of wages for labor, the conditions upon which suits at law should be prosecuted,[6] and even great questions of peace or war, were discussed in meetings of all the freemen;[7] and the action of the town was determined by the number of voices that shouted for the affirmative or the negative.

In the beginning all public affairs were passed upon by the whole body of freemen; but as the population increased, the frequent attendance upon town-meetings was found to be burdensome. Then certain persons were chosen to act for a limited time,—at first for six months, and afterward for a year,—to "order the affairs of the town." That was the origin of the Board of Selectmen, the name by which the chief executive body in town government is now widely known.[8] Subsequently other town officers were elected to look after special departments of the public service,—constables, surveyors of highways, clerks of the market, sealers of leather, packers of fish and meat, and hog-reeves.[9] A commissioner was also chosen at the

[1] Vol. I. p. 116.

[2] [See Mr. C. C. Smith's chapter, "Boston and the Colony," in Vol. I. p. 217, of this History. — Ed.]

[3] Boston Town Records as printed in *Second Report of Record Commissioners*, 1877, pp. 10, 90, 109, 152.

[4] Ibid. p. 46.

[5] Ibid. p. 6, *et seq.*

[6] Ibid. p. 5.

[7] See Richard Frothingham's Oration, July 4, 1874; *City Documents*, 68, 1874.

[8] They are referred to in the first volume of Boston records as "the ten men," "the nine men," and "the town's men," until 1647, when they are called "the selectmen." See Vol. I. pp. 388, 505 of this History.

[9] *Reeve* is from the Anglo-Saxon *Gerefa*, concerning the etymological connection of which with the German *Graf* there has been a good deal of controversy. It is curious to see how a once honored title has become degraded. The first civic temporal magistrates in England were the *Reves*. William the Conqueror, in the first charter granted to London, "greets William the Bishop, and Godfrey the *Portreve*." Later the Anglo-Saxon *Portreve* was superseded by the French *Mayor*. *Shire-reve* has been contracted to Sheriff; and the *Reve* survives only as the keeper of hogs.

annual meeting to receive the proxies for magistrates and county treasurer and carry them to the shire-meeting.

The system of government which grew up in this irregular way was full of make-shifts, — it would have vexed the soul of the political doctrinaire; but it was admirably adapted to the wants of a small, homogeneous community. It was covered with patches, but the patches protected just the places which hard wear threatened to expose. That it performed its functions to the general satisfaction of the people for a period of nearly two hundred years is shown by the fact that during that time they steadily resisted all attempts to change its original form. There were not wanting individuals who favored a change, and who had their patent devices for making the government better than the people; but so well satisfied were the majority of the voters with what they had, that they clung to the old system long after the growth of the town appeared to make a change necessary for the maintenance of good government.[1] Upon the suggestion of the selectmen a committee was appointed in 1708 to "draft a charter of incorporation" for "the better government of the town;" but at the annual March meeting in the following year the "town's men" refused to accept the draft which was submitted to them, and refused to refer the subject to any future meeting. The next attempt to make a radical change in the constitution of the government was in 1784, when, on the petition of a number of influential citizens, a committee of thirteen was appointed "to consider the expediency of applying to the General Court for an act to form the town of Boston into an incorporated city, and report a plan of alterations in the present government of the police, if such be deemed eligible." The committee reported two plans, — one making the town a body politic, by the name of "the Mayor, Aldermen, and Common Council of the City of Boston;" the other making it a body politic by the name of "the President and Selectmen of the City of Boston." At a meeting of the inhabitants it was voted, "by a great majority," "inexpedient to make any alterations in the present form of town government."[2]

In 1791 "the want of an efficient police" led to another petition for a change; and a plan was reported which provided for a division of the town into nine wards, and the election in each ward of two men who, with the selectmen, were to constitute the Town Council, with power to make by-laws and to appoint all executive officers except selectmen, town clerk, overseers of the poor, assessors, town treasurer, school-committee men, auditors of accounts, firewards, collectors of taxes, and constables, who were to continue to be elected by the legal voters. A good deal of time was given to the discussion of this scheme, and it was printed and distributed in hand-bills to all the inhabitants; but when the vote came to be taken upon its adoption, it met the fate of former schemes. Another report in favor of changing the

[1] [See Vol. I. p. 219; *N. E. Hist. and Geneal. Reg.* July, 1857; Quincy's *Municipal History of Boston*, ch. i. — Ed.]

[2] [There is in Harvard College Library a little tract of eight pages called *Two Plans for Forming the Town of Boston into an Incorporated City, Published by Order of the Town for the Perusal and Consideration of the Inhabitants.* The day named for the further consideration of them is June 17. — Ed.]

town government was negatived by a decisive vote in 1804. The next movement for a change was not made until 1815, when a committee submitted the draft of a bill which provided for the incorporation of the town under the name of "the Intendant and Municipality of the Town and City of Boston." The municipal council was to consist of the selectmen, chosen by the citizens in town-meeting, and two delegates from each ward chosen by the inhabitants of the ward. The Intendant was to be chosen annually by the selectmen and delegates; and was given powers which made him rather a mild chief executive. The title appears to have been imported either directly from France or from the Gallicized municipalities in the Canadas. This scheme came pretty near adoption, — nine hundred and twenty votes being in the affirmative and nine hundred and fifty-one in the negative.

What turned the scale against it, perhaps, and what would have been urged equally against any scheme by which the town government was to be changed to a city government, was the fact that there was no provision in the State Constitution which appeared to authorize the erection by the General Court of city governments. The subject was brought before the Constitutional Convention of 1820, by one of the Boston delegates, Mr. Lynde Walter, who procured the passage of a resolution instructing a committee to inquire into the expediency of so altering the Constitution, that the Legislature should have power to grant to towns charters of incorporation with the usual forms of city government. Daniel Webster, chairman of the committee to which the matter was referred, reported that it was expedient so to amend the Constitution as to provide that the General Court should have full power and authority to erect and constitute municipal or city governments in any corporate towns in the Commonwealth, provided such towns contained not less than a certain number of inhabitants. The proposed amendment was strongly opposed by some of the country members, who feared that the city governments would make laws by which "the inhabitants of the towns, going into the cities, would be liable to be ensnared and entrapped." The reasons for the proposed change were set forth very clearly by Lemuel Shaw, afterward the Chief-Justice of the Commonwealth. He said that it was not the intention to grant any special powers or privileges to the citizens of Boston, but simply to give them an organization adapted to the condition of a numerous people. All the towns in the Commonwealth possessed the powers and privileges of municipal corporations in England. They had power to choose their own officers, to send members to the General Court, to make by-laws, to assess and collect taxes, to maintain schools and highways, relieve the poor, and to superintend licensed houses and other matters of local police. The Constitution as it stood required all the inhabitants of a town to assemble in one body, be they few or many. The sole purpose of the proposed change was to provide an organization by which the voters in municipalities containing a large number of inhabitants would be enabled to meet in sections for the purposes of election, and to choose representatives who should be empowered to make the by-laws and

vote the supplies instead of the whole body. The amendment was adopted by the Convention and subsequently (April 29, 1821) ratified by the people of the State.

It would naturally be supposed that after this there would be no serious opposition to the proposed organization of a city government in Boston; but there was a conservative element in the old town which could not be convinced that any change was either necessary or desirable, even though the venerable John Adams supported the amendment in the Convention. The national census of 1820 gave the town a population of forty-three thousand two hundred and ninety-eight. The number of qualified voters exceeded seven thousand.

"When a town-meeting was held on any exciting subject in Faneuil Hall, those only who obtained places near the moderator could even hear the discussion. A few busy or interested individuals easily obtained the management of the most important affairs in an assembly in which the greater number could have neither voice nor hearing. When the subject was not generally exciting, town-meetings were usually composed of the selectmen, the town officers, and thirty or forty inhabitants. Those who thus came were for the most part drawn to it from some official duty or private interest, which, when performed or attained, they generally troubled themselves but little, or not at all, about the other business of the meeting. In assemblies thus composed, by-laws were passed, taxes to the amount of one hundred or one hundred and fifty thousand dollars voted on statements often general in their nature, and on reports, as it respects the majority of voters present, taken upon trust, and which no one had carefully considered except perhaps the chairman."

Among the number who resisted the proposed change, "by speech and pen, as long as there was any chance of defeating it," was Mr. Josiah Quincy, who afterward, in his *Municipal History of Boston*, made the statement above quoted. "He believed," says his son, "the pure democracy of a town-meeting more suited to the character of the people of New England, and less liable to abuse and corruption, than a more compact government."

In January, 1822, the subject was brought before a special meeting of the inhabitants in Faneuil Hall, on the report of a committee recommending that there should be a chief executive, called the "Intendant," elected by the selectmen; that there should be an executive board of seven persons called the "Selectmen," elected by the inhabitants on a general ticket; and that there should be a body with mixed legislative and executive powers called a "Board of Assistants," consisting of four persons chosen from each of the twelve wards. For three days the subject was debated with much earnestness and some heat. The report was amended by giving to the chief executive the title of "Mayor;" by putting "Aldermen" in place of the Selectmen; and by changing the name of the Board of Assistants to "the Common Council." The amended report was then put into the form of five propositions and submitted to the inhabitants to be voted upon by ballot, yea or nay. The vote on what may be considered the test proposition, —

namely, "that the name of 'Town of Boston' should be changed to 'City of Boston,'"—was two thousand seven hundred and twenty-seven in the affirmative, and two thousand and eighty-seven in the negative. The other propositions were all adopted by a greater or less majority.

Application[1] was immediately made to the Legislature for an act of incorporation; and on Feb. 23, 1822, the Governor approved "an act establishing the city of Boston," which is known as the first city charter. As the earliest departure, under Massachusetts laws, from the ancient system of town government, the act was regarded as one of grave importance. The city form of organization, copied in most cases from the form which had been established in London as early as the thirteenth century, had long been in use in other parts of the country. New York received a city charter in the English form in 1665, and several charters were granted in the name of the king to large towns outside the New England colonies, previous to the Declaration of Independence. The lord proprietor of Maine had exercised the right given him by his patent to make the little town of Agamenticus (now York), with two hundred and fifty inhabitants, a city under the name of Gorgeana, with a mayor, aldermen, common council and recorder; but when the province came under the jurisdiction of Massachusetts, the town system was substituted. In Connecticut, city charters were granted immediately after the Revolution; and so freely were they granted, that at last "a little clump of Indians took it into their heads to apply for city powers and privileges," which "convinced the Legislature of the impolicy of granting charters with so much liberality."[2]

The new charter of Boston, drafted by Mr. Lemuel Shaw, provided that the title of the corporation should be "the City of Boston;" that the administration of all the fiscal, prudential, and municipal concerns of the city, with the conduct and government thereof, should be vested in one principal officer, to be styled "the Mayor;" one select council of eight persons, to be denominated "the Board of Aldermen," and one more numerous council of forty-eight persons, to be denominated "the Common Council;" that the city should be divided into twelve wards; that the mayor, aldermen, and common councilmen should be elected on the second Monday of April annually, and enter upon their duties on the first day of May;[3] that the mayor and aldermen should compose one board, the mayor presiding and having a right to vote on all questions, but not the veto power; that the administration of police, together with the general executive powers of the corporation, and the powers formerly vested by law or usage in the selectmen of the town, should be vested in the mayor and aldermen; that all the other powers then vested in the town or in the inhabitants thereof as a municipal cor-

[1] [See the paper in chapter iii. of this volume. — Ed.]

[2] From Remarks of John Adams, in the Constitutional Convention of 1820. *Debates, Massachusetts Convention*, p. 195.

[3] By an act of the Legislature passed in 1825, the annual election was changed to the second Monday in December; and the officers then chosen entered upon their duties on the first Monday in January following. In 1872 the election-day was changed to the Tuesday after the second Monday in December.

poration should be vested in the mayor, aldermen, and common council, to be exercised by concurrent vote, each board having a negative upon the other; that the citizens in the several wards should choose, at the annual meeting in April, a number of persons to be firewards; and also one person in each ward to be overseer of the poor, and one person to be a member of the school committee.

JOHN PHILLIPS.[1]

At "a legal meeting of the freeholders and other inhabitants of the town of Boston," held in Faneuil Hall on March 4, 1822, the question, "Will you accept the charter granted by the Legislature?" was decided in the affirmative, by a vote of 2,797 to 1,881. Among the large number who voted in the negative there were many who opposed any radical change of the

[1] [This cut follows an engraving of a portrait owned by Mr. Wendell Phillips, kindly furnished by him. Mr. John Phillips died May 29, 1823. A memoir of Phillips, with an engraved portrait, appeared in the *Boston Monthly Magazine*, November, 1825; and a brief sketch, with a portrait, is also given in the *N. E. Hist. and Geneal. Reg.*, October, 1866; and an account of his family in Bond's *Watertown*, p. 885. There is also a sketch in Loring's *Orators*, p. 249. — Ed.]

old system, and others who were dissatisfied with the form of organization provided by the new charter.

Mr. Josiah Quincy, who had always taken an interest in town affairs, and who presided at the last town-meeting held in Faneuil Hall, was invited by many substantial citizens to be a candidate for the office of mayor. He accepted the invitation, without knowing, it is said, that the Federal leaders proposed to make Mr. Harrison Gray Otis the first mayor, preparatory to his elevation to the governorship of the State. That any respectable Federalist should be presumptuous enough to stand for any office which Mr. Otis was willing at that time to take, was sufficient to stir up a great deal of feeling among the party managers: it was much the same as if, twenty years later, Mr. Choate had allowed his name to be used for an office which Mr. Webster wanted. Mr. Quincy's supporters were not willing to release him from his engagement, however, and it does not appear that he was at all anxious to be relieved. It was not in his nature to be influenced, by weight or numbers, to withdraw from a position which he had once deliberately accepted. The night before the election the Democrats nominated Mr. Thomas L. Winthrop for their candidate, and threw enough votes for him to prevent an election, — a majority of all the votes being necessary for a choice. Mr. Quincy would undoubtedly have been elected had not the Democrats resorted to the trick of using Mr. Winthrop's name without his authority, and greatly to his displeasure.

Both Mr. Otis and Mr. Quincy then withdrew their names, and John Phillips[1] was elected without serious opposition. He was in many respects well qualified for the position; a man of rather pliable disposition, but of strict integrity and general good judgment, — a character well fitted for the somewhat delicate task of commending the new order of things to those who had been adverse to a change. One who knew him well, and knew the difficulties by which he was surrounded, has said: —

"Selected for the critical task of making the first experiment with a system new to the acquaintance, and, as far as then appeared, uncongenial in some degree with the habits, of his constituents, to the operation of which indefinite expectations were attached and a jealous observation directed, the Mayor exhibited that discretion and sound judgment which so eminently characterized him."

The new city government was organized in Faneuil Hall on May 1, 1822. The chairman of the board of selectmen delivered into the charge of the new authorities the town records and title deeds, and the city charter inclosed in a silver case. The Mayor, after paying "a just tribute to the wisdom of

[1] A descendant in the fifth generation from the Rev. George Phillips, the first minister of Watertown. He was born in Boston, Nov. 26, 1770; received his early education at the academy in Andover which bears his family name, and was graduated at Harvard College in 1788. He delivered the Fourth of July oration before the town authorities in 1794; and for many years acted as Town Advocate and Public Prosecutor. He served for twenty years as a member of the State Senate, and for ten years was President of that body.

our ancestors as displayed in the institutions for the government of the town, under which for nearly two centuries so great a degree of prosperity had been attained, and during which the great increase of the population of the place had alone made this change in the administration of its affairs essential," proceeded to remark, in respect of those "who encouraged hopes which could never be realized, and of those who indulged unreasonable apprehensions in regard to the city charter, that they would derive benefit from reflecting how much social happiness depended on other causes than the provisions of a charter." The policy of the new administration, to keep things substantially as they were, was thus foreshadowed; and it may be said that that policy was adhered to during the year, but little of importance being done beyond the organization of the several departments of the city government.[1]

The debt transferred from the town to the city amounted to about $100,000, and was incurred on account of two prisons, then in course of erection, and a new court house. The current expenses for the year 1822 amounted to about $249,000, and the tax levy for that year was $140,000. It was a day of small things as compared with the present time.[2] The appropriations to meet the current expenses for the financial year beginning May 1, 1889, amounted to $10,190,387; and the tax levy was $9,466,896.

The result of the first year's administration under the new charter did not meet the expectations of those who had been instrumental in procuring it. They were eager for a more energetic system, and they charged Mr. Phillips with pursuing a timid and hesitating course for fear of losing his popularity; but when he demitted office Mr. Quincy could say of him: —

"After examining and considering the records and proceedings of the city authorities for the past year, it is impossible for me to refrain from expressing the sense I entertain of the services of that high and honorable individual who filled the chair of this city, as well as of the wise, prudent, and faithful citizens who composed during

[1] The city clerk elected at this time — Samuel F. McCleary — continued to hold the office by successive annual elections until his resignation in 1852, when he was succeeded by his son, bearing the same name, who holds the office to-day; so that the city records from the beginning bear the attestation of a single name. A city seal was adopted, the motto for which was suggested by Judge Davis. It was taken from the following verse of the Scriptures: "Sit Deus nobiscum, sicut fuit cum patribus nostris." — III. Regum, viii. 57. As adopted for the seal it stands: "Si-cut patribus, sit Deus nobis." The impression within the motto contains a view of the city from South Boston Point.

[2] To show what a small part of the peninsula of Boston was occupied at the beginning of the present century, I venture to print the following, from Wendell Phillips, Esq: —

"Every incident that contributes to the life of the picture is valuable, though it may seem trivial; so I add this as illustrating how small Boston limits were eighty years ago.

"My father, the first mayor, built in 1804-5 the first *brick* house that was built on Beacon Street. It still stands on the western corner of Walnut and Beacon streets. Above and below there were a few wooden houses, and next the State House stood Hancock's *stone* house. This street (Beacon) was then considered *out of town*.

"When Dr. Joy was advised to take his invalid wife out of town for the benefit of country air, he built her, eighty years ago, a wooden house, which stood where Mrs. Tudor's house now does, — on the western corner of Joy and Beacon streets: the lot went back to Mt Vernon Street, or near it. I have often seen loads of hay, cut on the square between Joy, Walnut, Mt. Vernon, and Beacon streets, carried in to Dr. Joy's front gate, where Mrs. Armstrong's front door stands now. When my father moved into his Beacon-Street house, his uncle, Judge O. Wendell, was asked, in State Street, 'what had induced his nephew to move *out of town*.'"

[See the view of Beacon Street about this time, given in Mr. Stanwood's chapter. — ED.]

that period the city council. . . . Whatever success may attend those who come after them, they will be largely indebted for it to the wisdom and fidelity of their predecessors."

And Mr. Otis, in his inaugural address in 1829, said: —

"The novel experiment of city government was commenced by your first lamented mayor, with the circumspection and delicacy which belonged to his character, and which were entirely judicious and opportune. He felt and respected the force of ancient and honest prejudices. His aim was to allure and not to repel: to reconcile by gentle reform, not to revolt by startling innovation."

Mr. Phillips had no desire for a second term, his health having begun to give way. Josiah Quincy[1] was therefore sought as a candidate by the progressive element in the community. He accepted the position, and was elected, receiving 2,505 votes out of 4,766, — the whole number cast.

Mr. Quincy was at this time fifty-one years of age, — to him the prime of life; a man of large experience, of kindly disposition, but of most decided will. He left his impress on the government of the city as no other man has done. His administration, covering a period of six years, has formed a standard to which the efforts of his successors are continually referred. It was not a great office to be a mayor with limited power over a city of only forty-five thousand inhabitants; but he performed the duties in such a way as to give it more than a local importance, and to produce results of a lasting character. He was like an accomplished actor who takes a small part and makes of it a great one.

In his inaugural address, the Mayor gave prominence to the defects of the ancient town organization, and the remedy provided for them in the powers of the mayor. His object was to bring the responsibility of the chief executive into distinct relief before the citizens, and thereby prepare their minds for the prominent part which he intended to play. In order to put himself in a position to exercise to the full the powers conferred upon him as mayor and as a member of the board of mayor and aldermen, he did not hesitate to make himself chairman of all committees of the board. But such was his tact and his capacity for work, that this extraordinary proceeding does not seem to have excited any ill-feeling among his associates in the city council.

He first gave his attention to improving the sanitary condition of the city, and established the system of cleaning the streets and collecting house-offal, which has been followed to the present day, and which has proved a model of economy and efficiency. Under the town government the powers relative to the preservation of the public health had been vested in a board elected by the inhabitants; but the city charter transferred those powers to the city council, "to be carried into execution by the appointment of health

[1] Of Mr. Quincy's previous career in public life some account will be found in another part of this work.

JOSIAH QUINCY.[1]

commissioners, or in such other manner as the health, cleanliness, comfort, and order of the city might in their judgment require." When the new government was organized, three health commissioners were appointed with

[1] [Stuart painted Mr. Quincy twice, — the first time in 1806, a half-length, now belonging to the heirs of Edmund Quincy, of Dedham. In November, 1824, he painted him again, and this picture Miss E. S. Quincy gave to the Museum of Fine Arts in 1876 It is engraved on steel in Edmund Quincy's *Life of Josiah Quincy*, and is followed directly from the canvas in the above cut. (Mason's *Gilbert Stuart*, p. 243.) There was a third portrait, by Page, in 1842, in his robes as President of Harvard University; and a fourth, by Wight, about 1852, now in the Historical Society's gallery. A statue of Mr. Quincy, by W. W. Story, which likewise represents him in an academic gown, stands in Memorial Hall at Cambridge. Another statue, showing him in plain dress, executed by Thomas Ball, stands in front of City Hall, and a photograph of it is given in City Document, No. 115, for 1879. The document contains a description of the ceremonies of dedication, including a commemorative oration by his Honor F. O. Prince, then mayor of the city. There is a bust of Quincy by Horatio Greenough, and another by Crawford, in Memorial Hall at Cambridge. See E Quincy's *Life of J. Quincy*, p. 550; where is also an engraving from a photograph from life, taken in his eighty-ninth year. — ED.]

the general powers of the town board of health. They were unwise enough to stand in the way of certain reforms proposed by the Mayor, and they were speedily swept out of existence. The internal police of the city was placed under the superintendence of the city marshal; and the external police, covering the enforcement of the quarantine regulations, was placed under a single commissioner. The board of surveyors of highways was also abolished, and by legislative enactment the powers were conferred upon the mayor and aldermen, who have continued to exercise them up to the present day.

QUINCY MARKET AND FANEUIL HALL.[1]

The next important measure which Mayor Quincy initiated and carried out, and the one by which he is most generally known, was the establishment of a new market-house. The Faneuil Hall market-house was first opened in 1742; and at the time of which we are writing the whole space, occupied by stalls in and around the building, did not exceed fourteen hundred feet. The accommodations were not only insufficient for the wants of the inhabitants, but they were notoriously unhealthy and extremely inconvenient of access. The scheme proposed by the Mayor for enlarging the

[1] [This view follows the engraving in Quincy's *Municipal History of Boston*, taken by Hammatt Billings (1826), not long after the erection of the market-house. Pemberton Hill is seen in the distance. It was then sixty or more feet higher than now, and on its slope was a tower, built by Lieut.-Governor Phillips, in the garden of the old Faneuil house. The large trees were on the rear part of the Vassall estate, then occupied by Gardiner Greene; and they were a prominent land-mark for ships entering the harbor. A similar view is given in Snow's *Boston*, p. 378. See also Dearborn's *Boston Notions*, p. 115. — Ed.]

market was of such magnitude as to invite serious opposition, even from many of the most prominent citizens; and he had not only to win over to his views the members of the city council, but he had to procure the endorsement of his scheme by the inhabitants of the city and the Legislature of the Commonwealth. The opposition was bitter and determined, but the Mayor triumphed over every obstacle. What was accomplished can best be stated in his own words: —

"A granite market-house, two stories high, five hundred and thirty-five feet long, fifty feet wide, covering twenty-seven thousand feet of land, including every essential accommodation, was erected at a cost of one hundred and fifty thousand dollars. Six new streets were opened, and a seventh greatly enlarged, including one hundred and sixty-seven thousand square feet of land; and flats, docks, and wharf-rights obtained of the extent of one hundred and forty-two thousand square feet. All this was accomplished in the centre of a populous city, not only without any tax, debt, or burden upon its pecuniary resources, — notwithstanding, in the course of the operations funds to the amount of upwards of eleven hundred thousand dollars had been employed, — but with large permanent additions to its real and productive property." [1]

The corner-stone of the new market-house was laid on April 22, 1825, and the stalls were opened in 1827.[2]

Among other reforms instituted by Mr. Quincy soon after he came into office was the reorganization of the fire department. Its efficiency at that time depended largely upon the aid of the inhabitants, applied under the authority of the firewards who were elected annually by the citizens in each ward. "They formed lanes of by-standers, who, by their direction, passed

[1] Quincy's *Municipal History of Boston*, p. 74. [This history is reviewed by Francis Bowen in the *North American Review*, vol. lxxiv. An account of the semi-centennial celebration, Aug. 26, 1876, of the opening of the market, was published in 1877, by William W. Wheildon. — Ed.]

[2] It was due to the originator of the enterprise that his name should have been given officially to the new market; but the plausible statement that it was merely an enlargement of the old Faneuil Hall Market was sufficient, with the personal feeling against Mr. Quincy engendered by his persistence in carrying out his plans, to induce the city council to extend the name of the old market to the new. But the people have taken the matter into their own hands, and the new house will always be popularly known as "Quincy Market."

Since its establishment the character of the business transacted in it has almost wholly changed. It has ceased to be the place to which the householders of Boston generally resort for their supplies of provisions. It has come to be the great provision exchange for New England. It draws to its stalls food-products of the best from all parts of the world, and it distributes them all over the country; although its principal business consists in supplying the hotels and retail dealers in and around Boston, and the great summer resorts on the sea-shore and among the mountains of New England. The market owes much of its success and its popularity to the high character of the men who occupy it. Instead of disposing of the stalls annually by auction, as is customary in many other cities, it has always been the policy in this market to fix a reasonable rent for the use of the stalls, and renew leases to good tenants. This policy has not been without its results in maintaining a high standard in the quality of the articles offered for sale. Charges of "forestalling" and "monopolizing" have been often raised by a few discontented persons; but repeated investigations by committees of the council have failed to show that the influence of the market has been used to maintain high prices. The statute provision allowing sales from market-wagons on the streets around the market-houses, introduces an element of competition which effectually prevents any monopoly prejudicial to the public interests. The sales from these free street-stands may be said to regulate the prices of provisions in Boston. See *City Document* 100 of 1865, and *City Document* 91 of 1870.

buckets of water from pumps or wells in the vicinity to the engines playing on the fire, and returned them for further supply." The men who worked the engines were formed into companies, and received a small compensation for their services, besides being exempt from militia duty. "To be first, nearest, and most conspicuous at fires was the ambition of the enginemen; and the use of hose, as it had a tendency to deprive them of this gratification, was opposed." In 1823 several companies petitioned for additional compensation. It was refused; and in one day all the engines in the city were surrendered by their respective companies; and on the same day every engine was supplied with a new company by the voluntary association of public-spirited individuals. Application was then made to the Legislature for authority to reorganize the department; and in 1825 an act was passed giving the mayor and aldermen power to appoint all the engineers, firewardens, and firemen. The sense of security which the new organization gave is shown by the fact that the rates of insurance against fire on the real property within the city were reduced twenty per cent.

In the year 1821, just previous to the change in the municipal organization, Mr. Quincy, having given considerable attention to the subject of pauperism, was appointed chairman of a town committee on the subject of the relief and disposition of the poor of Boston. On his recommendation, and under his supervision, a tract of land was purchased on the northerly shore of South Boston, and a House of Industry was erected. The overseers of the poor — a body then elected by the town, and subsequently by the inhabitants of the city, and possessing statutory powers which made it largely independent of the city council — resisted the proposed change in the disposition of the paupers; and it was not until Mr. Quincy became mayor, and obtained additional legislation, that the reformation which he had recommended was fully carried into effect.

"The evils attendant on the promiscuous mingling of the honest poor with rogues and vagabonds were mitigated by the establishment of the first House of Correction, properly so called, in Boston during the first year of his mayoralty. A building in the jail-yard was used at first for this purpose, but the establishment was afterward removed to South Boston, near the House of Industry. The separation, more important yet, of the young convicts from the old in places of penal restraint led to the establishment of a House of Reformation for juvenile offenders, the results of which — both direct, in the large proportion of young persons who were saved to society by its means, and indirect, by the encouragement which its successful experiment has given to the system elsewhere — have been of the happiest nature."[1]

As chairman of the school committee, Mr. Quincy took an active interest in the public schools. His action upon one question, the maintenance of a high school for girls, raised a good deal of feeling against him at the time; and, if repeated at the present day in the face of the more numerous advocates of a higher education for women, the feeling would

[1] *Life of Josiah Quincy*, by Edmund Quincy, p. 394.

doubtless be intensified; but the principle which he stated at the time, as governing his opposition to the establishment of a high school which would be used almost wholly by the daughters of wealthy parents, was a sound one. "The standard of public education," he said, "should be raised to the greatest desirable and practicable height; but it should be effected by raising the standard of the common schools."[1]

During Mr. Quincy's second term he had the honor of receiving and entertaining General Lafayette, who was made the guest of the city. The building at the corner of Park and Beacon streets was given up to the city by the club which occupied it, and, having been completely furnished and provided with servants, was made the home of the distinguished visitor during his stay.[2]

There were many other events of interest in the municipal history of the city during Mr. Quincy's administration; but as they were of a temporary character the limits of this work preclude any description of them. It was hardly possible for any man to do what Mr. Quincy did during those years without raising an opposition which must sooner or later deprive him of an office held by the frail tenure of an annual election. As his sixth term drew to a close, the opposition combined and assumed a tone of bitterness and malignancy which has seldom been equalled even on a much larger political field. The reorganization of the fire department provoked the hostility of a class of voters who were active and somewhat unscrupulous. Then there were those whose private interests had suffered in the establishment of the new market-house and the penal and reformatory institutions, and in the enforcement of the laws relating to gambling, prostitution, and the sale of intoxicating liquors. In carrying out the street improvements and the enlargement of the market, a city debt, amounting to $637,000, had been created; and this excited consider-

[1] [See the chapters by Mr. Dillaway and Mrs. Cheney, in Vol. IV. — Ed.]

[2] [There is an account by General W. H. Sumner of Lafayette's visit, with the entertainment given him, in the *N. E. Hist. and Geneal. Reg.*, April, 1859. (See Drake's *Landmarks*, p. 354.) The editor has been favored with the use of a scrap-book, filled with newspaper clippings, broadsides, etc., collected by Miss E. S. Quincy during Lafayette's stay in America. A manuscript note in it says: "On Commencement day, Mayor Quincy called for Lafayette at his lodgings, and while the barouche waited for the Governor's carriage to precede, a crowd gathered. 'Have you ever been in Europe, Mr. Quincy?' asked the guest. 'No, never.' 'Then you can have no idea of what a crowd is in Europe. I declare, in comparison the people of Boston seem to me like a picked population out of the whole human race.'" (See also Edmund Quincy's *Life of Josiah Quincy*, 404.) An arch, which was erected on the Neck, just above Dover Street, bore this inscription, written by Charles Sprague: —

WELCOME, LAFAYETTE!

The fathers in glory shall sleep,
That gathered with thee to the fight;
But the sons will eternally keep
The tablet of gratitude bright.
We bow not the neck; we bend not the knee:
But our hearts, Lafayette, we surrender to thee!

In a recent account of this visit, by Ella R. Church, in the *Mag. of Amer. Hist.*, May, 1881, it is stated, in testimony of Lafayette's happy memory, that at the reception at the State House he recognized an elderly colored man who, as a servant of Hancock, had waited upon the Marquis when a guest of his master forty years before. The descendants of Major Judah Alden also preserve by tradition a remark which he made to that old soldier when he first saw him on this visit, — "Alden, how are you? I know you by your nose!" See also Dearborn's *Boston Notions*, p. 282. — Ed.]

able discontent among the taxpayers, although the Mayor was able to show that in carrying out these improvements the city had become possessed of real estate exceeding in value $700,000.[1] He could never have

PARK STREET.[2]

maintained his position as long as he did, had he not been a man of the strictest integrity, — a man against whom even an unscrupulous opposition

[1] The average rate of taxation during the last seven years under the town government was $8.15 on a thousand. During the first seven years, under the city government, it was $7.27.

[2] [The house on the left of the picture is the one occupied by Lafayette. It was built about 1804, by Thomas Amory, but with its extension was afterward converted into four dwellings. Malbone the painter, Samuel Dexter the lawyer, and Governor Christopher Gore have all lived in it. It is also seen in the heliotype of the Common, 1804–1810, given in another chapter. The portion above and beyond the main entrance became the residence of George Ticknor, the historian of Spanish literature, and in it he died. The window above the front door, and the two

found it impossible to frame a charge of dishonesty, — and had he not, moreover, constantly used his tongue and his pen to explain and defend his measures before the people.

At the municipal election in December, 1828, Mr. Quincy failed on the first ballot to receive a majority of all the votes cast. Another ballot was then taken with substantially the same result.[1] Thereupon the Mayor sent a note to the press, stating that "no consideration would induce him to again accept the office."

At the close of his term he summoned the two branches of the city council to meet in convention, and delivered an address which those who had made themselves conspicuous in opposing him must have long remembered. In concluding he said: —

"And now, Gentlemen, standing as I do in this relation for the last time in your presence and that of my fellow-citizens, about to surrender forever a station full of difficulty, of labor, and temptation, in which I have been called to very arduous duties, affecting the rights, property, and at times the liberty of others; concerning which the perfect line of rectitude — though desired — was not always to be clearly discerned; in which great interests have been placed within my control, under circumstances in which it would have been easy to advance private ends and sinister projects, — under these circumstances, I inquire, as I have a right to inquire, — for in the recent contest insinuations have been cast against my integrity, — in this long management of your affairs, whatever errors have been committed (and doubtless there have been many), have you found in me anything selfish, anything personal, anything mercenary? In the simple language of an ancient seer, I say: 'Behold, here I am; witness against me. Whom have I defrauded? Whom have I oppressed? At whose hands have I received any bribe?'"[2]

After Mr. Quincy's withdrawal from the canvass, Harrison Gray Otis was induced to become a candidate, and was elected without opposition for

windows beyond it, lighted his library, of which a view is given in Mr. Cummings's chapter in this volume. The house next beyond, originally the home of Abbott Lawrence, the merchant and ambassador, is now occupied by the Union Club. Mayor Quincy lived in a house further down the street. Park Street, when laid out by Charles Bulfinch in 1804–5, was called Park Place, and had the following residents from the church up: General Arnold Welles, Dr. John C. Warren, Richard Sullivan, Jonathan Davis, John Gore, Judge A. Ward, Jonathan Amory, Governor Gore. In 1860 the houses, going up the street, were occupied by Thomas Wigglesworth, Dr. J. Mason Warren, Mrs. T. W. Ward, Josiah Quincy, Jr., President Quincy, J. Sullivan Warren, Governor Henry J. Gardner, Mrs. Abbott Lawrence, George Ticknor. See view of Common in *Life of John C. Warren*. The statue of Daniel Webster, by Hiram Powers, standing in the State House yard, in the foreground, was erected in 1859, and Edward Everett delivered the dedicatory oration. See Editorial Note to the chapter on "The Bench and Bar," in Vol. IV. — Ed.]

[1] On the first ballot Mr. Quincy lacked eighty-three votes of a majority; and on the second ballot he lacked sixty-six votes.

[2] I have dwelt at some length on this early period of our municipal history, because the foundations of our present system were then established. Indeed, something more than the foundations were laid. It may be said in general terms that the only material changes made in the system which was put into operation during the administration and through the instrumentality of Mayor Quincy have been made in recent years; and have been necessitated, as the change from the town to the city government was alone necessitated, by the increase of population. See *Report* of Commissioners on the revision of the City Charter, *City Document* 3 of 1875.

three successive terms. He was at this time sixty-three years of age, having been born in Boston, Oct. 8, 1760.[1]

The principal recommendation which he had to make in his first address to the city council was that the project for railroad communication with the Hudson River should be encouraged. "Unless," he said, "the surveys and calculation of skilful persons employed in this business are fallacious, there is no doubt that a railroad from this city to the Hudson may be made with no greater elevation in any part than is found between the head of Long Wharf and the Old State House; and that the income would pay the interest of the capital employed."[2]

On the day fixed for the organization of the city government of 1830, Mr. Otis was unwell, and the members of the city council were invited to assemble at his private residence for the purpose of being qualified. It was a proceeding without precedent; but no one thought of questioning the propriety of any request from Mr. Otis. His invitation was equivalent to a command; and the aldermen and councilmen went to his house and were sworn in, and listened to the reading of the inaugural address. It appeared that the city debt was $883,630; and that the assets, exclusive of city lands, amounted to $257,341.42. The assessors' valuation of real and personal property for purposes of taxation was $29,793.00, and the rate of taxation was $8.10 on a thousand.[3] The fifth national census, of 1830, gave the city a population of sixty-one thousand three hundred and ninety-two.

In May of this year the Society for the Suppression of Intemperance petitioned for a band of music on the Common during the afternoons and evenings of the general election, and on the Fourth of July,—"such a practice having, in their judgment, a tendency to promote order and suppress

[1] He had been prominent in public affairs almost from the time of his leaving college. In 1788, when twenty-three years of age, he delivered the Fourth of July oration before the town authorities. He was a man of courtly manners and winning address. His style of oratory was much admired in those days; but his published speeches and addresses fail to sustain the reputation which he held among his contemporaries. His political popularity had been on the wane for some years, and he could not forbear making a pathetic reference to the fact in his first inaugural address as mayor. This address, delivered in Faneuil Hall in presence of a large assembly of citizens, had for its principal object the vindication of Mr. Otis's political career. To afford him an opportunity for so doing, in a sort of semi-official way, was probably the chief inducement to his acceptance of the office. His connection with the Hartford Convention having been made the basis of a charge of disloyalty, he took occasion to "distinctly and solemnly assert that at no time in the course of my life have I been present at any meeting of individuals, public or private, of the many or the few, or privy to any correspondence of whatever description, in which any proposition having for its object the dissolution of the Union, or its dismemberment in any shape, or a separate confederacy, or a forcible resistance to the government or laws, was ever made or debated; that I have no reason to believe that any such scheme was ever meditated by distinguished individuals of the old Federal party." [See H. C. Lodge's chapter immediately preceding this. — Ed.]

[2] [See further on this subject Mr. C. F. Adams's chapter in Vol. IV. — Ed.]

[3] It should be stated that the law in force at this time (see Rev. Sts. 1836, c. 7, §§ 15, 30, 37) permitted assessors after they had made a true valuation of the real and personal estate, to assess taxes upon a reduced value, provided their record should show both the real value and the assessed value. The assessors of Boston, from a date preceding 1830, and including 1841, assessed half the true value. From 1842 to the present time assessments have been made upon the full valuations.

an inclination to riot and intemperance." An appropriation was made from the city treasury to carry out the request of the petitioners.

On the recommendation of the Mayor, the city council voted to alter the Old State House, at the head of State Street, so as to provide accom-



H G Otis[1]

modations therein for the mayor, aldermen, common council, and other city officers. It was decided to take possession of the new apartments on

[1] [This cut follows a likeness painted by Gilbert Stuart about 1814, and owned by the late George W. Lyman, who kindly permitted it to be engraved. A memoir of Otis by Augustus T. Perkins is in the *Memorial Biographies* of the N. E. Historic, Genealogical Society, 1880, vol. i. See Loring's *Hundred Boston Orators*, p. 188. A portrait of Mrs. Otis, after a picture by Malbone, is given in Griswold's *Republican Court*. — Ed.]

September 17, the two hundredth anniversary of the settlement of the town. Mr. Josiah Quincy, who, after retiring from the mayoralty, had become President of Harvard College, accepted an invitation to deliver an address on the same day. Accordingly, on the morning of the seventeenth the two branches of the city council being assembled in convention, the Mayor made an address, "after which," as the record states, "the two branches went in procession to the Old South Church, escorted by the Ancient and Honorable Artillery Company, where an address was delivered by the Hon. Josiah Quincy, and a poem by Charles Sprague, Esq."[1]

In his inaugural address for 1831 the Mayor had no special recommendations to make except in regard to the administration of county affairs. What he had to say on this point led to the passage of an act by the Legislature, vesting all the property of the county of Suffolk in the city of Boston, and requiring the city thenceforward to furnish and maintain all the county buildings, and to pay all the county charges.

In the municipal election which took place Dec. 12, 1831, there were three prominent candidates, Charles Wells, William Sullivan, and Theodore Lyman, Jr. Mr. Wells and Mr. Lyman received, in round numbers, eighteen hundred votes each, and Mr. Sullivan eleven hundred. A second election was held December 22, the contest being between Mr. Wells and Mr. Lyman, and the former was elected by a majority of seven hundred and four votes, and re-elected in the following year without opposition.

The election of Charles Wells[2] was a sort of protest from the middle classes against the magnificent way of doing things inaugurated by Quincy and Otis, and against any further increase of the city debt. He had some knowledge of city affairs, having served as a member of the common council and the board of aldermen. He was a man of simple character, not much versed in affairs of state, but not ill-qualified, on the whole, to perform the ordinary duties of the mayor's office. He made no formal address when the city government was organized in 1832, and his two terms of service were not marked by any events of importance beyond the erection of the present Court House, the extension of Broad, Commercial, and Tremont streets, and the establishment and enforcement of strict quarantine regulations, by which the inhabitants were protected from the spread of cholera, then (in 1832) prevalent in the British provinces.

At the election which took place in December, 1833, there were two candidates for the mayoralty. Theodore Lyman, Jr., who was called the Jackson candidate, and William Sullivan, who was the candidate of the

[1] [See Vol. I p. 246. — Ed]. The only other notable event of this year was the exclusion of cows from the Common. Rights of pasturage on this public ground had been enjoyed by certain of the householders ever since 1660; and had the cows behaved with proper respect to the ladies, Mayor Otis would never have interfered with their ancient privileges.

[2] He was born in Boston, Dec 30, 1786, and was by occupation a master builder.

National Republicans, the party which had supported Mr. Wells. The contest resulted in the election of Mr. Lyman, who held the office for two terms.[1] He made no address when the government was sworn in on the first Monday in January; but he took occasion a few weeks later to send a long and carefully prepared message to the common council, recommending to its "early and earnest attention the subject of bringing a copious and steady supply of pure and soft water into the city of Boston." A portion

THEODORE LYMAN.[2]

of the inhabitants were supplied with water at this time by an aqueduct corporation, chartered in 1795. The water was conveyed from Jamaica Pond, in West Roxbury, through four main pipes of pitch-pine logs.[3] The

[1] He was a native of Boston, born Feb. 20, 1792, and was educated at Phillips Academy and Harvard College. A man of admirable parts, of good understanding, enlarged by a liberal education and extensive foreign travel, he was well equipped for a more responsible and dignified office than the one which a laudable ambition to serve his fellow-citizens had prompted him to accept.

[2] [This cut follows a likeness by Gérard, painted in Paris in 1818, and now owned by Colonel Theodore Lyman. There is a sketch of Mr. Lyman's character in L. M. Sargent's *Dealings with the Dead*, No. 56, p. 204; and a memoir by his son, Colonel Theodore Lyman, in the *Memorial Biographies* of the N. E. Hist. Geneal. Soc., 1880, vol. i. See the *Genealogy of the Lyman Family*, by Lyman Coleman, Albany, 1872. — Ed.]

[3] [The route of this aqueduct is shown in Dearborn's map of 1814, given in another chapter. — Ed.]

lineal extent of the pipes in Boston was about fifteen miles, extending on the easterly side of the city nearly to State Street, and on the westerly side to the Massachusetts General Hospital. In 1825, on the recommendation of a committee of the city council, Mr. Quincy appointed Professor Daniel Treadwell a commissioner "to ascertain the practicability of supplying the city with good water for the domestic use of the inhabitants, as well as for the extinguishing of fires and all the general purposes of comfort and cleanliness." Professor Treadwell subsequently reported that there were two places in the neighborhood of Boston from which an adequate supply of pure water could be obtained, and which appeared to possess advantages over all others; namely Charles River, above the falls of Watertown, and Spot Pond, in Stoneham. Estimates of the cost of bringing water into the city from those two places were furnished; but no further action was taken by the city council until 1833, when the Mayor was requested to apply to the Legislature for the necessary authority to supply the inhabitants with water. The authority was not granted; and there the matter rested until Mr. Lyman's message was received. The subject was then referred to a committee of which the Mayor was chairman, and they selected Colonel Loammi Baldwin, a distinguished engineer, to make a survey of the several sources of supply. Colonel Baldwin's report was of great and permanent value. It furnished the basis on which all subsequent surveys and reports relating to the water supply have been made. He came to the conclusion that Farm Pond, in Framingham, and Long Pond, in Natick, were the most eligible sources. The committee having the subject in charge recommended that the question of introducing water through the agency of the city council should be submitted to the people; but no action was taken beyond printing and distributing the engineer's report. Twelve years elapsed, during which a water supply was the principal topic of discussion in the city government; and then, in 1846, satisfactory legislation was obtained, enabling the city to draw from the sources recommended by Colonel Baldwin.[1]

On the night of Aug. 11, 1834, the Ursuline Convent, on Mount Benedict in Charlestown (now Somerville), was destroyed by a mob, composed largely of men who lived in Boston. Vague threats of what the "Boston Truckmen" intended to do were made for days and even weeks beforehand, but they produced no serious impression upon the authorities or upon the citizens generally; and when the mob rolled up to the convent doors and began its work of destruction, there was not a solitary policeman or other peace officer to bar its progress.

The Ursuline school, from which the institution derived its support, was composed almost entirely of Protestant pupils, many of them the daughters of wealthy or well-to-do parents living in Boston or in its vicinity; but dark stories had been circulated concerning the restraint put upon some of the

[1] [A history of the introduction of water into Boston was prepared by Nathaniel J. Bradlee, and printed in 1868; and a supplement, by D. Fitzgerald, was added in 1876. — Ed.]

nuns. One of them, while in delirium from brain fever, had escaped in her night-dress and taken refuge in a farm-house near by. While being taken back to the convent, her ravings had attracted attention, and it was said that she had fallen under the displeasure of the lady superior, and been long confined in an underground cell. About this time a sensational book, called *Six Months in a Convent*, was published as the work of a girl who had just escaped from the Ursuline Convent. "It purported to relate the threats and persuasions used by the inmates of the convent to make the writer a Catholic against her will; and it ended with an account of her escape from their clutches just in time to save herself from being carried off by force to St. Louis." The common people believed all these stories; and it must be said that the original impulse which moved those who organized the attack on the convent was not a bad one. They regarded this institution, and all such institutions, as "anti-Christian, anti-republican," and in every way "injurious to the best interests of the community;" but that feeling would probably never have moved them to acts of violence. What did move them was the belief that an old-world institution had been established among them where persons were deprived of their liberty, and where gross immoralities were practised by "a company of unmarried women placed for life under the sole control of a company of unmarried men." The way in which they proceeded to vindicate republican institutions and the laws of society cannot, of course, be excused from any point of view; but there is this to be said, that they acted from a much higher motive than the men who, in the following year, dragged Garrison through the streets, or who, many years afterward, broke up Antislavery meetings and resisted the enforcement of the Conscription Act.

As the mob surged up to the building, the lady superior, a woman of great courage and dignity, but altogether wanting in discretion, tore herself from the detaining hands of the sisters, and, rushing out on the front steps, ordered the men to disperse immediately; "for if you don't," she is reported to have said, "the Bishop has twenty thousand Irishmen at his command, in Boston, who will whip you all into the sea." One cannot help feeling a sort of admiration for the fiery little French-Irish woman, standing alone before some thousands of riotous Protestant Americans and making such a speech; but such a speech, if made, was not calculated to soothe the passions of those to whom it was addressed. Two shots were fired at this time by some one in the crowd; "and the affrighted nuns, hovering in the shadow of the door, behind my lady, pulled her back by force and barred the door." All the inmates of the institution then withdrew to the back-garden, and subsequently found refuge in a private house on Winter Hill. The doors of the convent were forced, the rooms ransacked, and the building was then set on fire and entirely destroyed. Several of the engine companies in Boston, attracted by the light of the fire, went to the scene with their engines, and were afterward charged with aiding the rioters; but the charge was not sustained. As the work of destruction went on, the spirit

of lawlessness and violence developed rapidly, as is usual in such cases, and was stimulated by drink. The lady superior was sought for, and had she been found she would probably have been killed.

On the day following the affair at Mount Benedict, there were serious apprehensions of a riot in Boston; and a conflict would undoubtedly have taken place between the returning rioters and the Irish population, had not the Mayor taken measures to prevent it.[1] He called a meeting in Faneuil Hall at one o'clock that day; and, after speeches by Mr. Quincy and Mr. Otis, resolutions were adopted in which the attack on the convent was denounced as "a base and cowardly act;" and the Mayor was requested to appoint a committee of citizens to investigate the affair, and "to adopt every suitable mode of bringing the authors and abettors of the outrage to justice."

On the request of the Mayor, the State authorities made arrangements to call out the militia in case the *posse comitatus* was found inadequate to the support of the laws; but no further disturbance occurred. Madame St. George, the vivacious lady superior, being unable to hire another building in this vicinity for her purpose, and making herself somewhat obnoxious by her snuff-taking, her levity, and her denunciations of the *canaille*, drifted off with her black-robed sisters into another part of the country, and was heard of no more by the "Boston Truckmen;" but the blackened and crumbling walls of the convent remain to mark the spot where once stood the most "elegant and imposing building ever erected in New England for the education of girls."[2]

In his inaugural address, at the beginning of the year 1835, the Mayor called attention to the city debt, now amounting to $1,265,164.28, and suggested that if the present policy of borrowing for all purposes that could not be considered as strictly belonging to the current expenses of the year was pursued, it was obvious that in a single century there would be an accumulation both of interest, which it would be troublesome and inconvenient to pay, and of principal, which it would be most burdensome to redeem. He recommended, therefore, that whenever any new public work was ordered, a certain proportion of the cost should be added to the appropriations of the year. To this recommendation we owe the establishment of a sinking

[1] Colonel Theodore Lyman writes:—

"I used to hear my father relate the amusing device by which he prevented an anti-Catholic riot in Boston, after the convent affair. The Charlestown mob had arranged to march in procession on the day following the fire, and to pass through Boston with a brass band, and bearing Catholic trophies stolen from the convent. *Per contra*, the Irish prepared to attack the procession when it entered the city.

"My father sent for the leader of the band, and said: 'You are to play at the *head* of the procession. The militia are under arms. They will fire. You are a stout man, and will be surely shot!' Immediately the band-master went in all haste and told them he would not play. This defection damped their ardor. However, a small number collected and began to move across Charlestown Bridge. At the city end my father had stationed a man on horseback, who, as the crowd drew near, turned and, in an ostentatious way, galloped furiously off. Immediately a cry rose: 'He is going for the military!' and the mob retired whence it came!"

[2] [See the statements on these events made in the chapter on "The Roman Catholic Church in Boston," in the present volume, and also *City Document* 11 of 1834. —Ed.]

fund, which has been of great value in preserving the city credit. He also dwelt at some length in his message on the subject of pauperism, and the reformation of juvenile offenders, making some valuable suggestions which were afterward acted upon.[1]

It was during this year that the famous demonstration against the Abolition movement occurred, of which a particular account is given in another chapter.[2]

On August 15 a great meeting was held in Faneuil Hall, to show that the wealth and intelligence of Boston were opposed to any interference with the constitutional guarantees which protected slavery. The Mayor presided; and it should be said of him, as of many others who took part in this meeting, that, while condemning the methods of the Abolitionists, he was heartily in sympathy with any measures by which, in a constitutional way, slavery could be restricted or exterminated. His Fourth of July oration before the town authorities, in 1820, and his Report to the Massachusetts House of Representatives, in 1822, on the admission into this State of free negroes and mulattoes, show that from early manhood he had sympathized with the Antislavery cause.

A few days before the outbreak (October 21), a letter written by a graduate of the theological seminary at Andover, whose integrity of character was vouched for by the professors, had been published in the newspapers, stating that George Thompson had said to him, three or four times, "that every slave-holder ought to have his throat cut." Thompson denied having made the statement; but in the face of a solemn re-affirmation of its truth by the person who originally made it, the denial went for little. What followed was undoubtedly due largely to the feeling created by this statement.

It was chiefly against Thompson that the passions of the hour were aroused; and when the Mayor, on inquiry, learned that Thompson was not in the city, and would not be present at the meeting whose announcement had caused so much solicitude on his part, there seemed to him no reason to apprehend any serious disturbance of the peace, and no extraordinary precautions were taken. Upon the seizure of Garrison, however, by the mob, — the circumstances attending which need not be repeated here, — and his rescue by the police, the Mayor ordered the officers to take him into the City Hall, and offered his own body as a shield against the rioters. After a stubborn fight, the entrance to the City Hall was

[1] The establishment of the State Reform School at Westboro', "for the proper discipline, instruction, employment, and reformation of juvenile offenders," the first institution of the kind in America, was due mainly to Mr. Lyman. He gave $22,500 to the school during his lifetime, the sole condition being that his name should not then be made public; and he left to it $50,000 more by his last will. The success of the school has been due as much perhaps to his wise suggestions at the time of its foundation as to his princely gifts. In the last codicil to his will he suggested a separate school of a similar character for girls; and to that suggestion we owe the institution now in operation at Lancaster. He was the benefactor, and for many years the manager, of the Farm School for Boys on Thompson's Island.

[2] [That on "The Antislavery Movement," by James Freeman Clarke. — ED.]

gained, and Garrison was conveyed upstairs to the Mayor's office. As the crowd attempted to follow, the Mayor took his stand on the steps, and declared that "any person who passed there would have to pass over his dead body." Night was coming on, and the excitement of the crowd showing no abatement, it was thought best to commit Garrison to the jail, ostensibly as a disturber of the peace. The necessary papers were made out by the sheriff, who was present, and after a hard fight he was put into a carriage and conveyed by a circuitous route to the jail, where he again barely escaped falling into the clutches of the crowd assembled about the entrance. As the doors of the jail closed upon him, he sank exhausted on a seat, exclaiming, "Never was a man so rejoiced to get into a jail before."[1] He received no personal injuries while in the hands of the mob. On the day following his commitment he was discharged from the jail, and, acting on the advice of friends, retired to the country for a short time.

The Mayor has been blamed for not having a sufficient civil force at hand to check the mob in the beginning, and for not calling out the military forces later, to prevent the necessity of committing Garrison to jail as a criminal; but it appears that he did use, as effectively as possible, the small police force at his command; and that, as the law then stood, he had no such power as the mayor now has to issue precepts calling the militia to the aid of the civil authorities. Mr. Samuel E Sewall, an Abolitionist who took part in the meeting which caused the riot, and who was very active in efforts for Garrison's security, said, in a communication to the *Liberator* shortly after the affair, that he believed the Mayor "was as sincerely desirous of suppressing the riot as any man in the city," and that he had "adopted such measures as seemed to him calculated to effect the object."

There is no doubt that the public sentiment of the community was in sympathy with the mob to the extent of breaking up the meeting; and while it was not in sympathy with it to the extent of doing personal violence to Mr. Garrison, it was not in favor of punishing those who laid violent hands upon him. According to one of the papers, the mob was composed, in part at least, of "gentlemen of property and standing." The *Advertiser* of the day following concluded a very short account of the affair by saying: —

> "As far as we had an opportunity for observing the deportment of the great number of persons assembled, there appeared to be a strong desire that no act of violence should be committed any further than was necessary to prevent these fomenters of discord from addressing a public meeting. If those who call these useless meetings have not regard enough for the public quiet to avoid the summoning of another assemblage of this kind, we trust the proper authorities will take care that they are bound over to keep the peace."

It is true, as has been stated, that hardly a night passes in any of our larger cities without greater violence done to person and to property than occurred in the so-called "Garrison mob." It would long ago have passed

[1] *Boston Atlas*, Oct. 22, 1835. This statement is corroborated by persons who heard Mr. Garrison use substantially the same words in describing the affair shortly after it occurred.

out of memory but for the prominence which the man and his cause afterward attained. Garrison was then an obscure individual. During Mr. Otis's administration the mayor of Baltimore requested him to suppress the *Liberator*, copies of which were sent to that city. Mr. Otis wrote to him that the "officers had ferreted out the paper and its editor, whose office was an obscure hole; his only visible auxiliary, a negro boy; his supporters, a few ignorant persons of all colors."

While the Mayor had no sympathy with the mob, and stood up bravely in defence of the object of its persecution, he was not as zealous as he might have been in seeking out and punishing those who had committed such an offence against the rights of an American citizen; not as solicitous for the good name of the city as he showed himself to be when he called a meeting in Faneuil Hall to denounce the destruction of the Ursuline Convent; not as energetic as the mayor of 1837, who in two hours mustered a sufficient military force to put down the great riot in Broad Street. Looking back upon it at this day, one cannot but regret that the feeling which prompted him to shield Mr. Garrison with his own body had not induced him to make the effort, at least, to punish those who had so openly defied his authority.

At the municipal election in December, 1835, Samuel Turrell Armstrong,[1] the Whig candidate, was elected mayor for the ensuing year. He held the office for only one term, and the principal acts of his administration appear to have been the erection of the gloomy iron fence which still encloses three sides of the Common, and the extension of the mall through the burial ground on Boylston Street. The new Court House in Court Square was completed this year; and the ringing of the church-bells was changed from eleven o'clock to one, — or, as it was said, from the hour for drinking to the hour for dining.[2]

For some reason Mr. Armstrong was not a candidate for re-election; and at the end of his term the Whigs put up Samuel Atkins Eliot,[3] a successful and highly respected Boston merchant, and elected him over the combined opposition by a majority of about eight hundred votes. He held the office for three years, and showed a remarkable aptitude for the performance of its duties. Following the custom of his immediate predecessors, Mr. Eliot made no formal address upon the organization of the city government at the beginning of his first term.

The most important act of his administration was the reorganization of the fire department. The necessity of bringing that department into a

[1] He was born in Dorchester, Mass., April 29, 1784; educated at the public schools, and became a printer, publisher, and bookseller. He had been a member of the board of aldermen for four years (1828–31); Lieut.-Governor of the State for three years (1833–35), and Acting Governor after the election of Governor John Davis to the United States Senate, March 4, 1835.

[2] [See Vol. II. p. 509. — Ed.]

[3] He was a native of Boston, born March 5, 1798, and had served as a member of the board of aldermen while Mr. Lyman held the mayoralty.

higher state of discipline and efficiency was made apparent to the citizens on the occasion of the Broad-Street riot. The succession of violent disturbances of the peace which took place during these early years under the city government shows that there must have been in these "good old times," as they are now called, a greater tendency to fighting and to the destruction of property than there is at the present time. The Boston of that day was small, but it was evidently intense. Its feelings could not



SAMUEL A. ELIOT.[1]

then, as now, find expression in the mild vagaries of a Radical Club. The truckmen, looking piously on the motto of the city seal, saw no other way of preserving the religion of their fathers than by burning the first convent that was set up in their neighborhood; the merchants, having in their keeping the material prosperity of the city, saw no other way of preserving that on which its prosperity rested — the Union of the States —

[1] [This cut follows a photograph, taken about 1850, kindly loaned by Charles W. Eliot, his son, President of Harvard University. A portrait of Mayor Eliot by Stuart, taken about 1817, is now in the possession of Professor Charles Eliot Norton, in Cambridge. For his family connections, see Vol. IV. p. 7. He died in 1862. — ED.]

than by hustling Mr. Garrison, and then locking him up in jail for allowing himself to be hustled; the firemen — the embodiment of a long series of Fourth of July orations — saw no other way of vindicating American muscle and American independence than by breaking the heads of their Irish fellow-citizens.

It was on Sunday, June 11, 1837, that the Broad-Street riot occurred. An engine company returning from a fire came into collision with an Irish funeral procession. It would not have been a serious affair had not an alarm of fire been sounded on the church-bells, calling other fire companies to the scene. The Irish had a temporary advantage in numbers; but the firemen, and those who came to their aid, soon got the upper hand. The Irish were driven into their houses, whither they were followed by their assailants, who had now reached a pitch of fury which, but for the appearance of the military, would have ended in the destruction of the whole Irish quarter of the town. No lives were lost, however, but there was a good deal of blood-letting, and considerable property was destroyed. It was estimated that over fifteen thousand persons were concerned in the affair. The Mayor was on the ground at the first alarm, and finding himself powerless to preserve order with the small police force under his command, he took immediate steps to have the military called out. Fortunately for the peace of the city, the National Lancers, constituting a company of cavalry in the militia organization of the Commonwealth, had just been formed, and the members being well known the authorities were able to bring them together at short notice. Portions of several companies of infantry were also collected; and in two hours after the affray began the Mayor entered Broad Street at the head of some eight hundred men under arms. The Lancers led the way and did the most effective service. The street presented a singular spectacle at this time. The air was full of flying feathers and straw from the beds which had been ripped open and emptied out of the windows; some of the tenement houses were completely sacked, the occupants fleeing for their lives. Peace was restored very soon after the arrival of the militia; but the people were in such an excited state that a military patrol was maintained through the night, and sentinels were posted at all the church doors to prevent false alarms. The energetic action of the Mayor alone prevented a serious loss of life. From the report of an investigating committee of the city council, it appears that the blame for beginning the disturbance rests about equally on the firemen and the Irishmen.

The moral which the Mayor drew from the occurrence was that both the police and fire departments ought to be reorganized. He succeeded in making the changes he desired in the fire department, but failed to secure the co-operation of the city council in his proposed reform of the police department. The firemen at that time received no compensation for their services. A small annual allowance was made to the engine and hook and ladder companies to pay for refreshments; but beyond that the free souls

composing the department disdained to receive anything. The Mayor saw that in order to secure discipline reasonable compensation must be made for the services required. He told the city council that "it ought not to be regarded as a matter of reproach to any one to receive pay for his labor." He saw no reason why the firemen should not be paid and still retain all the ambition, ardor, and generous spirit which characterize voluntary associations, and which are not less characteristic of naval and military corps. The compensation was intended as an inducement for the firemen to place themselves under that strict discipline necessary to insure efficiency, and not as an equivalent for perils which could not be really paid for. The ordinance reorganizing the department and fixing the pay of its members was passed and went into operation on the first of September. For several weeks it was necessary to maintain all over Boston volunteer patrols against incendiaries.

In the following year authority was procured from the Legislature for the appointment by the mayor and aldermen of police officers, with all the powers of constables except the power of serving and executing any civil process. Under this authority a small police force for day duty was organized and placed under the city marshal, who was the principal health-officer of the city. This force was entirely separate and distinct from the watch, which at this time included one hundred and ten watchmen and ten constables, who went on duty at six o'clock in the winter and at seven o'clock in the summer, and patrolled the streets until sunrise.

At the municipal election in December, 1837, the inhabitants were called upon to give in their votes on several amendments to the city charter proposed by the city council. Most of the amendments were merely for the purpose of curing certain defects in the phraseology of the original act; but there was one which transferred from the inhabitants of the several wards to the city council the power of electing overseers of the poor, and this proposition was regarded with so much disfavor that all the amendments were defeated. They were again submitted at a special election in February, 1838, and again rejected.

Under the authority of an act of the Legislature, a superintendent of alien passengers was first appointed by the city in 1837. It was made the duty of that officer to prevent the landing of persons incompetent to maintain themselves, unless a bond was given that the person should not become a charge to the city or the State within ten years; and the sum of two dollars was collected from all other alien passengers as a commutation for the bond. Some years afterward this assessment of "head money," as it was called, was resisted by the transportation companies; and a case being carried up to the Supreme Court of the United States, the law which authorized it was declared to be unconstitutional.

The erection of a hospital for the insane was begun in 1837, on the grounds adjoining the houses of Industry and Correction, in South Boston; and was opened for patients in 1839.

In his inaugural address at the beginning of the year 1838 the Mayor referred to the commercial crisis which had occurred during the previous year, and stated that it had produced far less general distress in this community than in some others. He recommended the erection of a new city hall and a county jail; but no action was taken on these recommendations beyond procuring plans and estimates for the former. No other measures of importance received the attention of the city council during this year.

At the charter election in December, 1839, Jonathan Chapman,[1] the Whig candidate, was elected mayor, and held the office for the three following years. When he took office in January, 1840, he addressed the city council at some length, recommending, as the principal object of their efforts, the gradual reduction of the city debt. From $100,000 the debt had in eighteen years risen to $1,698,232; but the city had in the mean time acquired a property which not only accommodated the public business, but furnished an income which covered more than half the interest on the debt; and it owned, besides, about $200,000 in bonds and notes, and between five and six million feet of land and flats. The national census taken this year gave the city a population of ninety-three thousand three hundred and eighty-three. The valuation of the real and personal property of the city for purposes of taxation amounted to $47,290,800,[2] and the rate of taxation was $11 on $1,000. The annual current expenses of the city, excluding all except those for ordinary purposes, and also the payments on account of the principal or interest of the city debt, amounted to about $425,000. The public schools absorbed nearly a quarter of this amount.

The project of building a new city hall on land lying between the Court House and School Street, which had been purchased for the purpose during the preceding year, was not favored by the Mayor. When, later in the year, a new building for the probate and registry offices was completed, and the old county court house was abandoned, the city council decided to remodel the old building for the purposes of a city hall. This was done for a comparatively small expense, and the city government took possession of its new quarters on March 18, 1841, and listened to an address from the Mayor.

The year 1840 formed a sort of epoch in the commercial history of the city. Through the enterprise of Mr. Samuel Cunard, steam navigation was established between Boston and Liverpool.[3] The event was celebrated by a great dinner, given on July 22, in a pavilion in front of the Maverick House

[1] He was born in Boston, Jan. 23, 1807, and was the son of Captain Jonathan Chapman, who had served in the office of selectman for the town of Boston. He received his education at Phillips Academy and Harvard College, and entered the Suffolk Bar from Judge Shaw's office. He possessed considerable literary ability; was a contributor to the *North American Review*, the *Christian Examiner*, and the newspapers of the day, an effective speaker on social and political occasions, and altogether a man of rather brilliant parts.

[2] See note p. 234.

[3] [See Mr. H. A. Hill's chapter in Vol. IV., and the Mayor's Inaugural Address, *City Document* 2 of 1841.— Ed.]

at East Boston. Referring to the matter in his inaugural address at the beginning of the following year, the Mayor said it had already given to the city a commercial importance unknown to her before; and when considered in connection with the great internal improvement through this Commonwealth, so shortly to be completed, the most important results to our prosperity might justly be anticipated. The period of general depression in the various branches of industry and business seemed rapidly giving place to one of activity and success; and he thought he could say truly that in no period of the city's history had her prospects been so bright and cheering.[1]

During this year the Mayor incurred the enmity of the sellers of intoxicating liquors by temporarily increasing the police force for the purpose of prosecuting the violators of the law. There was a license law in operation at this time, which authorized the mayor and aldermen to grant as many licenses to retail spirituous liquors as in their opinion the public good might require. The Mayor was opposed to a license law, and in his address to the city government of 1842 he gave his views on the question at some length. It appears that he prosecuted the violators of the liquor law simply because they were law-breakers, and not because he expected in that way to cure the evils of intemperance. He objected to the license law because it created a monopoly, and because its enforcement necessitated the entering of a man's house or place of business for the purpose of procuring evidence. He said: —

"Let the licensing system be entirely done away, as wrong in principle and injurious in effect. Let the severest penalties be affixed to the keeping of disorderly houses. Demand of your police to keep the outside in order, — to see to it that the public peace is preserved, and the public proprieties in no way violated. But as to the use of spirituous liquors within, so long as it is peaceable and in order, leave that to individuals, and above all to the Washingtonians, who have grasped the subject in the right way."

During the year 1841 another revision of the city charter was made and submitted to the Legislature, but no action was taken by that body; and the Mayor in his address at the beginning of the following year urged a renewal of the application for additional legislation. The application was made, but the higher power "smiling put the question by."[2]

[1] The great internal improvement referred to was the Western Railroad, which was completed and opened to the Hudson River in 1841. The city government "noticed this joyous occasion" by visiting Albany, and receiving in return a visit from the officers of that city. [See the chapter on "The Canal and Railroad Enterprise of Boston," by Charles Francis Adams, Jr., in Vol. IV., and Mr. Hamilton A. Hill's chapter on "The Trade, Commerce, and Navigation of Boston," in the same volume. — Ed.]

[2] In the ordinary affairs of the city nothing of importance beyond what has been mentioned occurred during Mr. Chapman's three years of service; but it ought perhaps to be mentioned as something beyond the ordinary, that on Feb. 2, 1842, a public dinner was given to Mr. Charles Dickens, at which the Mayor made quite a notable little speech, full of the kind of wit that is appreciated on such occasions; and that on Nov. 24, 1841, the Mayor's wife danced with the Prince de Joinville, at a great ball in Faneuil Hall.

Martin Brimmer[1] was the next mayor of Boston. He was the Whig candidate, and was elected by a majority of two thousand and sixty-one votes over Bradford Sumner, the candidate of the "Loco-focos."

His address at the organization of the city government on Jan. 2, 1843, was devoted largely to the question, which had been agitated for some years, of building a new prison for the county of Suffolk. He pointed out the defects of the old jail in Leverett Street, and the difficulty of caring for its inmates in a manner suited to the requirements of the times. He had given considerable attention to the subject of prison discipline and construction, about which an active controversy was going on at that time; and he made some suggestions in his address which were acted upon when, at a later day, the new jail was constructed in Charles Street.

Mr. Brimmer was also deeply interested in the cause of public education, and was an ardent supporter of the new departure advocated by Horace Mann. During his mayoralty he gave much thought to the improvement and increase of the Boston schools. At that time the literature of education was scanty. A valuable work — *The School and the Schoolmaster*, by Alonzo Potter and George B. Emerson — had recently been published, and the Mayor had an edition of three thousand five hundred copies printed at his own expense, and sent a copy to each public school and school committee in the State.[2]

In his address to the city government of 1844 the Mayor sketched the rapid growth of the city during the preceding twenty-two years, for the purpose of impressing his associates with "the importance of enlarged views in relation to the improvements of the city, in extending and beautifying the streets and public places, in a careful attention to internal health and police, in an enlarged system of internal and external intercourse, in a liberal encouragement of charitable and literary institutions, in a far-sighted preparation for the moral, literary, and physical education of the rising generation."

The policy inaugurated by Mr. Chapman for a gradual reduction of the city debt was continued by Mr. Brimmer. The debt which amounted to $1,698,232, in 1840, was reduced under Mr. Chapman's administration to $1,594,700, and under Mr. Brimmer's to $1,423,800.

At the charter election, Dec. 9, 1844, several propositions in regard to procuring a supply of pure water for the inhabitants of Boston were submitted to a popular vote. The proposition to take the supply from Long Pond in Natick and Framingham, or from any of the sources adjacent thereto, as recommended by Colonel Baldwin, was adopted by a vote of six thousand two hundred and sixty yeas, to two thousand two hundred and four nays. The Mayor was thereupon instructed to apply to the Leg-

[1] Mr. Brimmer was born in 1793, and graduated at Harvard College in 1814. Although engaged in mercantile pursuits he was always interested in public affairs, and previous to his election as mayor had served one term in the board of aldermen, and one term as a representative in the Legislature.

[2] [See Mr. Dillaway's chapter on "Education, Past and Present," in Vol. IV. — Ed.]

islature for the necessary authority; and the last important act of his administration was a compliance with this instruction.[1]

Mr. Brimmer having declined a re-election for a third term, there was a remarkable contest over the election of his successor. Thomas Aspinwall Davis was the candidate of a new political organization, called the Native American party; Josiah Quincy, Jr., was the candidate of the Whigs, and Adam W. Thaxter, Jr., was the Democratic candidate. On the first ballot Quincy received four thousand four hundred and sixty-four votes; Davis, three thousand nine hundred and eleven, and Thaxter, two thousand one hundred and seventy-three. There being no choice, Mr. Quincy withdrew, and Thomas Wetmore was put forward as the Whig candidate. He proved less popular than Mr. Quincy, and on the second ballot Davis led; but Colonel Charles G. Greene, who had been nominated as the Democratic candidate in place of Mr. Thaxter, received sufficient votes to prevent a choice. It was not until the eighth ballot was taken, on Feb. 21, 1845, that Mr. Davis received a bare majority, and was declared elected. His principal opponent on the last ballot was Mr. William Parker, a Whig, who had been chosen chairman of the new board of aldermen, and who acted as mayor until Mr. Davis was sworn in on February 27. Mr. Parker appears to have had some feeling over his defeat, as he immediately withdrew from the board of aldermen.

Mr. Davis's inaugural address, delivered on February 27, was devoted mainly to the subject of a water supply; but he could not forbear referring to the contest over his election, and saying a few words in defence of the party which had brought him forward. He said: —

> "The numerous and exaggerated statements that have been freely circulated in reference to the objects and aims of the American Republican party, which has recently sprung into existence and is so rapidly increasing in many parts of the country, require a word upon this subject. It is not the object of the American party, by word or act, to engender unkind feelings between the native born and foreign born citizen. Its object is, by the establishment of general and salutary naturalization and registration laws, by educational and moral means, to place our free institutions upon such a basis that those who come after us, the descendants both of the foreign and the American citizen, may be free and independent."

On March 25 the Legislature passed an act authorizing the introduction of water from Long Pond; but the act was not to take effect unless accepted by a majority of the legal voters of the city. The question of its acceptance was voted on at special meetings held in the several wards on May 19, and it was rejected by a small vote; the principal cause of its rejection being the extraordinary powers given to the three water commis-

[1] [*History of the Introduction of Pure Water into the City of Boston*, by N. J. Bradlee, with a continuation from 1868 to 1876 by D. Fitzgerald, two vols., maps, and plans, Boston, 1868–1876. See also, on the matter specially referred to, *City Documents*, 1844. — Ed.]

sioners, who were, by the terms of the act, to be appointed as the agents of the city council.

On October 6, Mr. Davis having been ill for some time, and unable to perform the duties of his office, sent his resignation to the city council; but it was not accepted, and he continued to be the nominal head of the city government until November 22, when he died. He was a man of excellent character, but lacked the qualities essential to success in the administration of a public office.[1]

At the charter election on Dec. 8, 1845, there were three candidates for mayor: Josiah Quincy, Jr., nominated by the Whigs; John T. Heard, by the Democrats; and William S. Damrell, by the Native Americans. Mr. Quincy was elected by a handsome majority; and on the eleventh of the same month the city council elected him, as authorized in such cases by the city charter, to fill the office until the beginning of the next municipal year. During the interval between November 22 and December 11, Benson Leavitt, then chairman of the board of aldermen, acted as mayor.

Josiah Quincy, Jr.,[2] served in the office of mayor from Dec. 11, 1845, to the first Monday in January, 1849. He had a thorough knowledge of municipal affairs, and his administration was characterized by much of the energy and ability which distinguished his father's service of the city. In his inaugural address on Jan. 5, 1846, he dealt with the water question in a way to secure the hearty co-operation of his associates in the government. The time for deliberation, he said, had passed. The time for action had come. A competent and disinterested commission had decided that Long Pond was the source from which this blessing was to be derived, and the honor of beginning the important work had been conferred upon the present administration. He then proceeded to make a financial statement, from which it appeared that the cost of introducing water, estimated by the commissioners to be $2,651,643, was more than covered by the value of the city lands, estimated at that time to be worth $3,175,000. The funded city debt on Jan. 1, 1846, amounted to $1,085,200, showing a reduction of over $600,000 since 1840. This favorable exhibit of the city's financial condition had much to do with securing the approval of the citizens to the next act of the Legislature, authorizing the introduction of water. Ten days after the new government came in, the Mayor was authorized to petition for another act. It was granted, in the form desired, on March 30, and accepted by the citizens on April 13, the vote standing four thousand six hundred and thirty-seven in the affirmative, and only three hundred and forty-eight in the negative. On May 4, James F. Baldwin, Nathan Hale,

[1] His ancestors were among the earliest settlers of the town of Brookline, Mass., where he was born on Dec. 11, 1798. He was educated in the public schools, and at the time of his election as mayor was engaged in business as a jeweller.

[2] He was born in Boston, Jan. 17, 1802, and was educated at Phillips Academy and Harvard College. He was a member of the common council for four years (1833–37), and its president for three years. [His portrait is given in Mr. Adams's chapter in Vol. IV. — Ed.]

and Thomas B. Curtis were chosen by the city council as commissioners under the act; and on August 20 the ceremony of breaking ground for the beginning of the work at the lake was performed by the Mayor, assisted by his father and the venerable John Quincy Adams. At the collation which followed, the Mayor called attention to the name by which the source of supply was generally known, and said the name Long Pond was like the name John Smith, without distinction. He suggested, therefore, that the Indian name "Cochituate" should be substituted, and the suggestion was immediately adopted.

On Oct. 25, 1848, in the last year of Mr. Quincy's mayoralty, there was another celebration, this time on Boston Common. The rising of the sun was saluted with a hundred guns, and by the ringing of all the church-bells. A great procession was formed, which marched through the streets and then to the Common, where an ode, written by Mr. James Russell Lowell, was sung by the school children, and addresses were made by the Mayor and by Mr. Nathan Hale, chairman of the water commission. After the citizens had been duly impressed with the importance of the blessing about to be bestowed on them, the Mayor inquired if it was their pleasure that water should then be introduced. There was a tremendous affirmative, and thereupon the gate was opened, and a column of water six inches in diameter rose to a height of eighty feet. What followed is thus described by the historian of the water works: —

> "After a moment of silence, shouts rent the air, the bells began to ring, cannon were fired, and rockets streamed across the sky. The scene was one of intense excitement which it is impossible to describe, but which no one can forget. In the evening there was a grand display of fireworks, and all the public buildings and many of the private houses were brilliantly illuminated."

The committee on finance, of which the Mayor was chairman, was authorized in 1846 to borrow money to the amount of $2,500,000, for carrying on the work; but they found great difficulty in negotiating a loan upon any reasonable terms. The leading European bankers who were consulted on the subject united in saying that the repudiation of some of the States had made it impossible to dispose of American bonds. During a part of 1847 the rate for money was two per cent a month, on the best paper. In April of that year it was decided to advertise for a loan of a million dollars. The city's financial condition was so well presented to capitalists, that the finance committee were enabled to place the whole amount at a little less than six per cent, a lower rate than was obtained by the United States.

During Mr. Quincy's first term the police force was reorganized. Francis Tukey, who occupies a large place in the traditions of the department, was appointed city marshal. He was a police officer of the French school, possessing great coolness and audacity, a thorough knowledge of the weaknesses of human nature, and an entire indifference as to the methods by which he accomplished his ends. On a larger field, and under a less dem-

ocratic form of government, he would have been one of the noted civil officers of his time. He made himself the terror of evil-doers, and, it must be added, of some who were not evil-doers. As the law then stood, the city was obliged to maintain a night-watch, separate and distinct from the police force. The watch numbered at this time about one hundred and fifty men, and were under the control of a captain. They were in the habit of enveloping themselves in large coats, and, after a round or two at the beginning of their watch, retiring to the shelter of the watch boxes, which were then provided, and slumbering peacefully until relieved. Marshal Tukey's force consisted in the beginning of only twenty-two day men and eight night men, — the night men being a sort of detective force, and, under the lead of their dashing chief, doing more effective police service than the whole night-watch. This force was gradually increased to forty patrolmen for day duty, twenty patrolmen for night duty, and five regular detectives. In 1853 the Legislature passed an act authorizing the city council to unite the watch and police, and in the following year the union was effected.

Among other police regulations introduced during Mr. Quincy's term, was one requiring licensed places of amusement to abolish what was known as the "third row," — a place which for years had been set apart in all the theatres for the special accommodation of prostitutes. By the Mayor's casting vote, licenses for the sale of intoxicating liquors were refused. "When I left the office," says Mr. Quincy, "there was no place where such liquors were openly sold. An attempt was made on this account to prevent my re-election for a third term, but after a most excited canvass I was rechosen."

In order to make good his statement as to the city's means for meeting its obligations, the Mayor urged upon the city council the importance of preparing the lands owned by the city for public sale. In 1847 he was authorized to contract for filling a portion of the marsh lands on the easterly side of the Neck, known as the South Bay; and under the contracts then made an extensive tract of land was graded, laid out in streets and lots, and made ready for the market.

The subject of providing a new jail for the county of Suffolk, to which reference has already been made, was discussed a good deal during the first two years of Mr. Quincy's administration; but the two branches of the city council were unable to agree upon any plan of action. In 1848 the city solicitor gave an opinion that the duty of providing a county jail was imposed by law upon the board of mayor and aldermen, who in this matter, as in some others, had the powers of county commissioners. The Board lost no time in exercising its authority. The project of erecting the jail in connection with the House of Correction at South Boston was abandoned; a large lot of land on the north-easterly corner of Cambridge and Charles streets was purchased, and before the Mayor retired from office he signed the contracts for the new building.

The reforms in our public school system which Horace Mann and George B. Emerson were advocating at this time received the cordial support of the Mayor. The "double-headed system," as it was called, under which a grammar master and a writing master exercised a divided authority over the schools, was abolished; women were more generally employed as teachers, and larger school buildings were erected.

At the municipal election on Dec. 11, 1848, John Prescott Bigelow,[1] the Whig candidate, was elected by a majority of two thousand four hundred and twenty-seven votes, although all shades of the opposition were represented in the four candidates who ran against him. He occupied the office for three terms, and performed its duties with marked ability and discretion.

In his inaugural address at the organization of the government in 1849, he dwelt particularly on the action of the mayor and aldermen of 1847 in refusing licenses for the sale of intoxicating liquors. The attempt, he said, to suppress the traffic in that way had utterly failed. The number of drinking places had augmented to an extent never before witnessed, and there had been an appalling increase of intemperance and its attendant crimes. He therefore recommended that the license system be re-established, as, with all its defects, it produced better results than the prohibitory system. The Mayor's recommendation on this point was sustained by the grand jury of Suffolk County, who expressed the opinion that "the entire interdiction of the sale of ardent spirits, however beneficial its effects may be in small communities, is wholly inoperative for good in a great city." But the aldermen were unanimously opposed to the granting of licenses; and on a test case which came up in the board on March 3, 1849, the Mayor had not a solitary supporter. A majority of the members of the board were re-elected for the following year, and therefore the question was not taken up. In 1851 the increase of drunkenness and crime caused the aldermen to propound certain interrogatories to Marshal Tukey. In reply to the question, "How many places are there where intoxicating liquors are sold?" he stated that there were fifteen hundred such places; and in reply to the request "to furnish an opinion as to the best method of checking the increase of crime and the traffic in liquors," he contented himself with the simple statement, — "Execute the law." This novel proposition appears to have filled the aldermen with such astonishment that they were unable to do anything further that year. In 1852 a prohibitory liquor law was passed by the Legislature. Governor Boutwell, who first vetoed the bill and afterward approved it, said "it contained new principles of legislation and was of doubtful expediency." Before it went into effect the board of mayor and aldermen granted about five hundred innholders and victuallers licenses under the

[1] He was born in Groton, Mass., on Aug. 25, 1797, and was educated at Harvard College. His father was a well-known lawyer, and his grandfather, Colonel Timothy Bigelow, won an honorable reputation in the war of the Revolution. The new mayor had taken an active interest in City and State affairs, having served for seven successive terms in the common council (1827–33), and for the same length of time (1836–42) as Secretary of State.

provisions of the old law. A complaint was made by some of the prohibitionists against Moses Williams, who had received one of the licenses, with a view to testing the power of the board to grant it; but the court sustained the license.

Mr. Bigelow did not look with much favor on the plans of his predecessor for the erection of a new jail. He suggested that it might be found advisable to cancel the contracts, and alter the old building in Leverett Street. The aldermen decided, however, to proceed with the work, modifying the plans so as to make a considerable reduction in the expense. The building was completed in 1851, at an expense, including the site, of about $450,000.

The great expense involved in introducing and distributing water, and in raising the grade of the city's lands in the southerly section of the city justified the Mayor in criticising any further expenditures which would add to the city debt. He called attention for the first time to the fact that the high rate of taxation which these expenditures involved was inducing many of the largest owners of personal property to escape into the country at the annual period of taxation. The number of citizens who thus evade the payment of their proportion of the expense of providing for the public safety and convenience in the city where they reside during seven or eight months in the year, and where their business is protected during the whole year, has steadily increased since Mayor Bigelow's time. Several attempts have been made to check it by legislative enactments; but the decisions of the highest court, as to the right of a man to choose his domicil, have made the new legislation practically inoperative.

During the summer of 1849 Asiatic Cholera prevailed to an alarming extent; the death rate exceeded that of any previous year in the history of the city. With a population of about one hundred and thirty thousand, the number of deaths was five thousand and eighty; one-fifth of the number being caused by the epidemic.

The seventh national census, taken in 1850, gave the city a population of one hundred and thirty-six thousand eight hundred and eighty-one, showing an increase of about sixty-two per cent during the preceding decade. The rapid growth of the city at this period was due to the opening of communication by rail with the West and by steamship with the East. The assessors' valuation of real and personal property within the city this year amounted to $180,000,500.[1] The tax levy was $1,237,000; and the rate of taxation was $6.80 on a thousand. The funded debt of the city on April 30, 1850, including water loans, was $6,195,144.35. In his address to the city government at the beginning of 1850 the Mayor said: "I have reason to believe that there is no other city in the world, certainly not in our country, the affairs of which in proportion to its size are administered at so great an expense as our own. The current annual expenditures of the

[1] For an explanation of the remarkable increase in the valuation between 1840 and 1850 see note to p. 234.

city of New York, with more than three times our population, do not more than double those of Boston."

Among the noteworthy events of this year in which the local government had an interest was the breaking up of a meeting in Faneuil Hall, called to congratulate George Thompson, then a member of Parliament, on his arrival in this country. Mr. Edmund Quincy presided. When Wendell Phillips attempted to speak there were cheers for Webster, for Jenny Lind, and for the Union, so loud and long continued that he was unable to proceed. Mr. Thompson undertook to read an address, but was obliged to give it up, and the meeting was declared adjourned. The persons who interrupted the proceedings were good-natured, but determined that neither Thompson nor his sympathizers should be heard. Marshal Tukey, who was present with a considerable police force, took no steps to check the disturbance; and Mr. Quincy subsequently lodged a complaint against him in the board of aldermen. At the hearing before a committee of the board he met the charges against him with the statement that he acted under the instructions of the mayor; and the committee so found, and exonerated him.

At the beginning of the year 1851 the Mayor was able to state that every section of the city was supplied with pure water. The whole cost of the water-works at that time amounted to $4,321,000. The aggregate length of streets, courts, and lanes through which main and distribution pipes had been laid was ninety-six miles; and the number of water-takers was thirteen thousand four hundred and sixty-three.

During the year 1851 the new almshouse on Deer Island was completed at a cost of about $150,000. The Mayor recommended that all the inmates of the House of Industry at South Boston should be removed to Deer Island; and his recommendation was subsequently carried out. The system of telegraphic fire alarms invented by Dr. William F. Channing was introduced this year; and although the old-fashioned engines were then in use, it was said to be hardly possible for a great fire to occur again. The first steam fire-engine was introduced into the department in 1854. It was long regarded as a failure, and the firemen found the English language quite insufficient to express the contempt they felt for it. But continued experiments led to improvements; and in 1860 the manual engines were banished to those rural districts where the stagecoach was still in use, the steam-engines took their place, and the character of the department was wholly changed. The new fireman is as unlike the old fireman as the crew of a modern steamship is unlike the crew of a sailing vessel of thirty years ago.

On April 2, 1851, the police arrested Thomas Sims, a fugitive slave, and locked him up under the Court House to await the decision of the United States authorities on a process for his rendition. The day-police, numbering at that time forty men, were armed with mariners' cutlasses, and drilled in anticipation of a disturbance; but as Sims was a disreputable fellow, the public sympathy was not actively enlisted in his favor, and on April 12, at

four o'clock in the morning, he was marched down State Street under a police guard, and placed without opposition on board a vessel bound for Savannah. Mr. Charles Devens, Jr., then United States Marshal, applied to the mayor and aldermen for a detail of police officers to aid in transporting Sims back to the State from which he had escaped; but the application was refused on the ground that the city needed all its officers for home duty.[1]

The board of aldermen of this year gained a sort of flickering notoriety by refusing the use of Faneuil Hall for a reception in honor of Daniel Webster. The ground of the refusal was that a similar application from the Abolitionists had been denied for fear of a disturbance. The intense indignation of Mr. Webster's friends can easily be imagined. On the day following their refusal another meeting of the mayor and aldermen was held, and a motion made to reconsider the action. The mayor and three aldermen voted to reconsider, and four aldermen voted in the negative. Mr. Moses Kimball, a member of the board, declined to vote, and there being a tie, the motion to reconsider did not prevail. At a meeting of the common council held a day or two afterward an order was passed appointing a joint committee "to tender Honorable Daniel Webster, in the name of the city council of Boston, an invitation to meet and address his fellow-citizens in Faneuil Hall at such time as he shall elect." The mayor and aldermen then met, and after passing a resolution asserting their own dignity and independence, concurred unanimously in the action of the common council. When the committee waited upon Mr. Webster at the Revere House and humbly asked him to signify his pleasure in the matter, he treated them very coldly, and said he would give his answer in writing. The answer was a curt one: "It will not be convenient for me to accept the invitation." When election day came the mayor and aldermen found that political preferment was not to be obtained through snubbing Mr. Webster. They were, all and singular, remanded to private life, and there they mostly remained. In the following year, on an invitation from a new and revised city council, Mr. Webster addressed his fellow-citizens in Faneuil Hall, "the doors on golden hinges turning," — as Mr. Choate said.

The completion of the railroad lines connecting the city with the Canadas and the great lakes was celebrated in September of this year. The official report published by the city says: "However extensive and brilliant may have been the public pageants on other occasions, not one, it is believed, has on this continent surpassed, if any have equalled, that of September 17, 18, and 19." On the first day the President of the United States, accompanied by the members of his cabinet, arrived and were received by the city and State authorities; and there was a military review on the Common. On the second day there was an excursion down the harbor in the morning; in the afternoon, Lord Elgin, Captain General and Governor-in-chief of the British Possessions in North America, arrived with his suite, and was formally received by the Mayor; and in the evening there was a grand military ball in

[1] [See the chapter on "The Antislavery Movement." — Ed.]

Union Hall. On the third day there was a procession, followed by a dinner on the Common, at which three thousand six hundred persons sat down; and in the evening, fireworks and illuminations. Altogether it was a very brilliant affair, and the Mayor did the honors of the city very handsomely.[1]

At the charter election on Dec. 8, 1851, there were four candidates for the mayoralty. John H. Wilkins received a plurality of votes, but not a majority; and a new election was held on December 24, at which Benjamin Seaver,[2] the Whig candidate, was elected, receiving only one vote more than the united votes of his opponents. Mr. Seaver held the office for two terms. A service of five years (1845–49) in the common council had given him a knowledge of city affairs which, with his business training and his executive ability, made him an excellent chief magistrate. It was said that he owed his first election to the police; and it is undoubtedly true that Marshal Tukey directed his men to work for Mr. Seaver; but if the marshal looked for special favor on account of his political support, he had a very imperfect knowledge of the character of the man whom he had assisted to office. The law then in force required the annual appointment of police officers; and when the Mayor came to make his appointments for the year he made some changes which the marshal criticised rather freely. Mr. Seaver was not a man to be criticised with impunity by a subordinate. He lost no time in putting another man at the head of the police force, and Marshal Tukey ceased to be a terror to anybody.

The new mayor looked upon the office to which he had been elected as essentially a business office, and he applied business principles to his administration of it. During the preceding six years the city had been engaged in works which had added largely to the city debt. Those works had been substantially completed, and the Mayor felt that it was time to pause and husband the city's resources for a while before entering on any new enterprises. That the record of his administration does not occupy so large a space as that of some others is an evidence of the Mayor's firmness in resisting the temptation to make a name at the expense of the city. The most important act of his administration was the vote to erect a building for the Public Library; but the story of that institution's inception and progress is to be told elsewhere.[3]

On the recommendation of the Mayor a board of land commissioners was established in 1853, to take the place of a joint committee of the city council which had been found unequal to the duties imposed upon it; and burials within the city limits, except in particular cases, were prohibited after the first of July, 1853.

Henry J. Gardner, afterward Governor of the Commonwealth, was president of the common council during Mr. Seaver's two terms; and on retir-

[1] [See the chapter on "Canals and Railroads," in Vol. IV. — Ed.]

[2] He was born in Roxbury, April 12, 1795; educated at the Roxbury Grammar School; and at the time of his election was engaged in business as an auctioneer.

[3] [In Vol. IV., by the Editor of the present work. — Ed.]

ing from the chair on Dec. 29, 1853, he delivered an address in which he gave prominence to the question of revising the city charter. He pointed out so clearly and forcibly the changes which an experience of thirty years had shown to be necessary, that the city council of the following year applied to the Legislature for a new act of incorporation which was granted on April 29, 1854.

At the municipal election on Dec. 12, 1853, there were three candidates for mayor: Benjamin Seaver, the nominee of the Whigs; Jerome Van Crowninshield Smith,[1] the nominee of the Native American party; and Jacob Sleeper, the nominee of the Temperance men. Mr. Seaver received the highest number of votes, but not a majority; and on the third ballot, taken Jan. 9, 1854, Dr. Smith was elected. During the interval between the first Monday in January and the date at which the new mayor was sworn in (the sixteenth of that month) Mr. Benjamin L. Allen, the chairman of the board of aldermen, acted as mayor.

The new mayor was a most indefatigable worker, and seemed to have an ambition to leave some enduring memento in every department of science, art, literature, and politics. Without undertaking to pass upon his achievements in the more retired walks of life, it may be said that as a man of affairs he was not entirely successful. He made a great many suggestions for the improvement of the city government, but fortunately for the city's credit few of them were carried out. He thought the police appointments would be improved if twelve men were elected by popular vote, one from each ward, with power to appoint all police officers, subject to the approval of the mayor and aldermen. He recommended the sale of Quincy Market to private individuals; the erection of an insane asylum at Deer Island; the erection of a tall tower on Beacon Hill, for the use of the fire telegraph and fire department offices; the forced sale of city lands in order to promote the erection of buildings; the appointment of a physician in every ward to be paid by the city for serving the poor. He was never taken quite seriously as a chief magistrate.

In 1853 an act had been passed authorizing the city council to unite, by ordinance, the watch and police departments; but no action was taken until the following year. On May 26, 1854, the old watch, which had been in

[1] Dr. Smith was born in Conway, New Hampshire, on July 29, 1800; graduated at Brown University in 1818, and subsequently took the degree of *Medicinæ Doctor* at Williams College. He served in the office of city physician for a number of years, and in that way became familiar with city affairs. Like the famous Whittington, he had a sort of premonition of his coming greatness. The day on which he came to Boston to seek his fortune happened to be the very day when the first mayor of the city was sworn into office. Seeing a large number of people moving in one direction he asked the cause, and was told that a *mare* was to be inaugurated in Faneuil Hall. Finding that the exhibition could be enjoyed without expense, he joined the moving throng, and was presently looking down from a quiet corner in the gallery upon what appeared to be a religious ceremony. He awaited in breathless expectation the advent of the animal whose name was in everybody's mouth; and it was not until after the ceremony was concluded that he could be made to understand the significance of what he had witnessed. He had a presentiment that he should some day be the central figure of such an exhibition, and he shaped his career accordingly.

existence as a department of the town and city government since 1631, was abolished, and a police department was established, consisting of two hundred and fifty men under the charge of a chief of police, two deputies, and eight captains of divisions. The form of organization adopted at this time was not materially changed until 1878, when the department was placed under a commission appointed by the mayor. By an ordinance passed in 1863, the system of annual appointments was changed to appointments during good behavior.

On the very day that the new police force entered upon its duties it was called upon, at a moment's notice, to suppress a riot in Court Square, caused by the attempt to release Anthony Burns, a fugitive slave, who had been arrested by United States officers and confined temporarily in the city prison. For nine days, while the hearing on the question of Burns's rendition was going on, the city was in a fever of excitement. The efforts of the city authorities were directed solely to the preservation of order, and the execution of the mandates of the court.[1]

On November 15 of this year the inhabitants voted to accept the revised city charter. It went into effect for the purpose of electing municipal officers on the second Monday in December, and for all other purposes on the first Monday in January following. The principal changes introduced by the new charter may be briefly summarized as follows: the persons having the highest number of votes at municipal elections were to be declared elected; the mayor was deprived of his vote on matters coming before the board of aldermen, and was given a qualified right to veto all acts of the city council, and all acts of either branch where an expenditure of money was involved; the board of aldermen was enlarged from eight to twelve members, and all the executive powers of the corporation, formerly vested in the selectmen of the town and in the board of mayor and aldermen of the city, were transferred to it; the mayor, when present at meetings of the board, had the right to preside; the school committee, which had consisted of the mayor, the president of the council, and two persons elected annually from each ward, was enlarged by the election of six persons from each ward, two being elected annually.

It was not the intention of those who drafted the new charter to curtail the mayor's powers, but their work had that effect. Following the precedent established by the elder Quincy, it had been customary for the mayor

[1] Burns was taken into custody on the evening of May 24, 1854, and on the following day taken before Edward Greely Loring, who was a United States commissioner, and who also held the office of judge of probate for Suffolk County. On the evening of May 26, a great meeting was held in Faneuil Hall to protest against the outrage on liberty. George R. Russell presided. While Wendell Phillips was speaking, a person entered the hall and announced that a mob of negroes was in Court Square attempting to rescue Burns. The meeting immediately dissolved, and the persons composing it flocked to the Court House and attempted to break down the doors. One constable was killed and several persons were seriously wounded. Burns was finally remanded to slavery; but subsequently he was bought by some Northern people and sent to Canada, where he died in 1862. Edward G. Loring was removed from the office of judge of probate, and was then appointed by the President judge of the court of claims at Washington. [See the chapter on "The Antislavery Movement" in this volume. — Ed.]

to act as chairman of all the most important committees of the city council; and as the chief executive officer of the corporation, and as a member and chairman of the board which had not only succeeded to all the executive powers formerly exercised by the selectmen of the town, but which had equal powers with the common council as a legislative body, he was in a position to exercise a powerful influence upon the management of city affairs. Under the new charter, the mayor continued to have the power of appointing police officers, but his appointments were subject to approval by the aldermen, and the administration of the police department was placed entirely in the hands of the aldermen. That board also had control of the fire department, the health department, the markets, the streets, the county buildings and the granting of licenses for various purposes; and where their action did not involve an expenditure of money the mayor had no power to pass upon it.

There has been no general revision of the city charter since 1854. Numerous changes have been made, both directly and indirectly, by subsequent legislation, the most important of which will be pointed out further on; but the mayor's power, although somewhat increased, is still far from being what is necessary to secure a responsible and an efficient executive.

At the charter election in December, 1855, Alexander Hamilton Rice,[1] the "Citizens'" candidate, was chosen mayor for the ensuing year. The Native American, or "Know-Nothing" party, as it had come to be called, had fallen into disrepute, and its candidate, Dr. Nathaniel B. Shurtleff, failed of an election by some two thousand votes. Mr. Rice possessed most of the qualifications by which an enduring success in public life is achieved, — a pleasing address, a knowledge of men and affairs, more than ordinary readiness and ability as a public speaker, and a keen sense of the popular wishes. During the two years that he served in the office of mayor the affairs of the city were managed with prudence and economy. In his first address to the city council he announced as the guiding principle of his administration the improvement of the institutions and means already possessed by the city, and the avoidance of new and dazzling enterprises which, however promising, might prove in the end to be only costly experiments.

The most important act of the government during Mr. Rice's first term was an agreement on the part of the city with the Commonwealth and the Boston Water-Power Company, by which provision was made for the improvement of the territory now known as the Back Bay. It should be stated that previous to the year 1827 the city held the fee in about one hundred acres of flats in this locality. In that year it ceded to the Boston Water-Power Company its title to these flats in consideration of the right to dis-

[1] Mr. Rice was born in Newton, Mass., on Aug. 30, 1818, and received his education in the public and private schools of the neighborhood, and in Union College at Schenectady. On leaving school he sought employment in Boston, and at the time of his election was the leading member of a firm engaged in the manufacture of paper. He had served as a member of the school committee and the common council, having been president of the latter body in 1854.

charge the drainage from the adjoining territory into the Back Bay basin. It was provided in the agreement made at that time that the water in this basin should be kept at a certain specified depression below high-water mark. This led to the erection of buildings on the surrounding territory at a grade fixed with reference to the drainage into a bay several feet below high-water mark, and presently the accumulation of sewage matter caused a nuisance from which the city has not yet ceased to suffer. In assenting to this arrangement with the Water-Power Company, it must be said that Mr. Quincy did not show his accustomed foresight. The exercise of the right which the city had acquired created a nuisance which made the right valueless. The new agreement entered into on Dec. 11, 1856, provided, among other things, for the construction of a large sewer from Camden Street, through lands of the Water-Power Company and the Commonwealth, to Charles River. This tripartite agreement, although forming the basis of the great improvement on the Back Bay, was never fully carried out; and in 1864 a new agreement was entered into, establishing a more complete system of streets and sewers for this territory.

The management of the public institutions of the city, including under that head the House of Correction, the Houses of Industry and Reformation, and the Lunatic Hospital, was at this time in the hands of three distinct boards, which were not always in harmony on questions affecting the city's interests. Mr. Rice recommended that all these institutions should be placed under the government of one board elected for different periods of service, and composed in part of members of the city council and in part of persons chosen from the citizens at large. In 1857 the Legislature passed an act establishing such a board, and providing for the election of its members by concurrent vote of the city council. The board is still in existence, and has fully answered the purpose for which it was organized.

In 1857 the Mayor recommended the establishment of a city hospital, transmitting to the city council at the same time a memorial from several leading physicians, giving their opinion of the necessity and value of such an institution. In the following year an act was passed by the Legislature authorizing the city to establish and maintain "a hospital for the reception of persons who, by misfortune or poverty, may require relief during temporary sickness." Elisha Goodnow, who died in 1851, had bequeathed to the city twenty-five thousand dollars for a local hospital, provided it was established either at the South End or South Boston; but no definite action was taken until 1860, when a site was selected at the South End on land reclaimed from the sea, and a hospital building was erected thereon and opened in 1864.

On Dec. 14, 1857, Frederic Walker Lincoln, Jr.,[1] was chosen mayor for the following year. He was known as the Faneuil-Hall candidate, having

[1] Mr. Lincoln was a descendant of Samuel Lincoln, who settled in Hingham as early as 1637. He was born in Boston Feb. 27, 1817, and received his education in the public and private

been nominated by representatives of different parties who held a convention for that purpose in Faneuil Hall. Charles B. Hall, his opponent, was also put forward as a Citizens' candidate, but was badly beaten, Mr. Lincoln receiving a majority of nearly four thousand votes.

As an administrative officer Mr. Lincoln was eminently successful. That he won the respect and confidence of his fellow-citizens to an unusual degree is shown by the fact that, without any effort on his part, he held the office of mayor for a longer time than any individual who preceded him or who has succeeded him.

The first year of his administration was not marked by any measures of special importance, unless the uniforming of the police may be so regarded. That was an act of great local interest, and the policemen and their friends said a good deal about copying the customs of the Old World, and turning free Americans into liveried servants. But the citizens who had often searched in vain for a policeman in citizen's dress looked favorably upon a change which would enable them to know an officer when they saw him.

In 1859 an act was passed by the Legislature, to take effect when accepted by the citizens of Boston, annexing to the city a considerable tract of land and flats on the Back Bay, formerly included within the city of Roxbury; and providing that no buildings should be erected between Arlington Street and Charles Street. The act was accepted by an almost unanimous vote of the citizens on April 26, 1859, and a plan was soon after adopted for the improvement of the Public Garden. An attempt was made by several public-spirited individuals to preserve the Back Bay as an open space for sanitary purposes, and to that end a number of elaborate plans were submitted to the State and city authorities;[1] but the General Court saw an opportunity to put some money into the State treasury by cutting the territory into house lots, and greed carried the day.

In 1859 Mr. Lincoln was successful in securing the co-operation of the United States authorities in the preservation of Boston Harbor. It appeared from the testimony of the old pilots that the water was shoaling in many places in the harbor, owing to the encroachments upon the headlands and islands. In a special message to the city council, the Mayor recommended the appointment of a commission of United States officers to make a scientific examination of the subject. The recommendation was approved, and the Mayor went to Washington and saw the heads of the Treasury, War, and Navy departments, — Cobb, Floyd, and Toucey, — three men who occupy a bad eminence among American cabinet officers. They were extremely gracious to the representative of Boston, and immediately complied with his request to detail General Totten, chief of the engineer corps, Pro-

schools. When only thirteen years of age he was apprenticed to a maker of mathematical instruments, and at the time of his election to the mayoralty he had risen to a prominent position among the business men of the city. He had served two terms as a member of the lower branch of the State Legislature (1847–48), and had been a delegate to the Constitutional Convention of 1853.

[1] [One is given in the folio edition of Drake's *Boston*. See also *Documents of the Massachusetts Senate, No.* 186, 1859. — Ed.]

fessor Bache, superintendent of the coast survey, and Commander Davis of the Navy, to make the proposed examination. During the seven years following, the commissioners made ten reports, which have been of immense value in securing appropriations from the National Government for the improvement of the harbor, and in preventing by wise legislation any further encroachments upon the ship-channels.[1]

The national census of 1860 gave the city a population of 177,992. The valuation of real and personal property for purposes of taxation amounted to $276,861,000. The amount of tax raised for State, county, and city purposes was $2,530,000; and the rate was $8.99 on the $1,000. The funded city debt amounted to $8,491,599.

In the latter part of this year another collision occurred between the Abolitionists and those who were opposed to the Antislavery agitation. Through the instrumentality of some rather obscure individuals a meeting was called in Tremont Temple, on December 3, to commemorate the anniversary of the execution of John Brown, and to consider the question, How can American Slavery be abolished? The election of a Republican President, and the threatening attitude assumed by the South, had the effect of making a good many men, especially those whose business interests would be endangered by any disturbance of the established order of things, deprecate any expressions in this section of the country which would appear to identify the Republican party with the supporters of John Brown; but in undertaking forcibly to prevent such expressions they only scattered the coals and propagated the fire. The promoters of this meeting, having hired the hall for a legal purpose, had a right to be protected in its use; but the city authorities did not protect them. A large number of persons opposed to the objects of the meeting quietly entered the hall as soon as the doors were open, elected their own chairman and secretary, and adopted a series of resolutions, in which John Brown and all "aiders and abettors in his nefarious enterprise" were heartily denounced; and it was declared that the people of this city "had submitted too long in allowing irresponsible persons and political demagogues of every description to hold public meetings to disturb the public peace and misrepresent us abroad." "They have become a nuisance," the resolutions said, "which in self-defence we are determined shall henceforward be summarily abated." In the midst of the confusion consequent upon these proceedings the chief of police entered the hall accompanied by several trustees of the building, and stated that he had orders from the Mayor to dismiss the meeting and to clear the hall; which he proceeded to do. In the evening the Antislavery people held a meeting in a small church for colored people at the West End, and although riotous demonstrations were made in the streets, the police force was sufficient to preserve order. It was known that the Mayor had taken the precaution to have two companies of cavalry under arms at

[1] For further details in regard to the measures taken for the preservation of the harbor, see the chapter on "Boston Harbor" in Vol. IV.; also City Documents, 1859–66.

their armories to act in case of emergency. On the following morning the *Advertiser* said: —

"The cry of 'free speech,' which will no doubt be set up on behalf of those who yesterday saw their meeting taken out of their hands, can find little support among unprejudiced observers. . . . Sensitive as the chord is which any appeal for free speech touches, it will hardly vibrate in response to the appeals of those who claim that glorious privilege only to abuse it; and what abuse of it could be more flagrant or more deserve condemnation than to use it simply as the means of adding to a great national excitement the peril of misleading one section of the country as to the sentiment which pervades the other, and embittering still further that controversy which now divides the States of the Union."

This may be taken as a fair expression of the sentiments of moderate Republicans of that day.

In the charter election of December, 1860, political feeling ran very high. Joseph Milner Wightman[1] was the candidate of both wings of the Democratic party and of the Old Line Whigs. Moses Kimball was the Republican candidate. The Webster Whigs were still a power in Boston, both socially and politically, and they threw the whole weight of their influence against Mr. Kimball on account of his action as a member of the board of aldermen that refused the use of Faneuil Hall in 1851 for the Webster reception. Mr. Wightman, who had formerly acted with the Whig party, but who had been carried into the Democratic ranks by the Antislavery agitation, was elected by a majority of over three thousand votes.

As an executive officer Mr. Wightman was not wanting in energy or in honesty of purpose; but he lacked dignity and discretion. His administration fell upon an important period in our municipal history. The extraordinary demands upon the city authorities, growing out of the war, enlarged the powers and duties of the mayoralty to an unprecedented extent, and raised many questions new to municipal legislation. It required a man of much more than ordinary ability to manage the affairs of the city at such a time to the satisfaction of a community which had been favored with chief magistrates who were generally dignified and sometimes wise. But while Mr. Wightman was not a man of more than ordinary ability, he possessed a good deal of energy and enthusiasm, and it was a time when energy and

[1] He was born in Boston on Oct. 19, 1812, and was the son of English parents. At the early age of ten he had been obliged, by the death of his father, to leave school and become apprenticed to a machinist. While serving out the terms of his indenture he eagerly availed himself of every opportunity to acquire a knowledge of mathematics, geometry, natural philosophy, and mechanical engineering; and soon after coming of age he went into business as a manufacturer of philosophical apparatus. The discussion of the question concerning the introduction of water into the city first led him to take an interest in local affairs. He was extremely active in promoting the scheme which was finally carried out, and from that time forth he has had a conspicuous part in municipal politics. He was a prominent member of the school committee for ten years (1845–55), and a member of the board of aldermen from April, 1856, when he was elected to fill a vacancy, to January, 1859. In both these positions he performed services which have been of permanent value to the city.

enthusiasm were wanted. He was put into the office by those who had been opposed to the election of a Republican President, but no one ever had occasion to charge him with lukewarmness in responding to the demands of the national administration for means to put down the Rebellion.

The Antislavery agitators, who were indignant over the failure of a Republican mayor fully to protect their freedom of speech, looked with considerable alarm upon the accession to power of a Democrat who might be inclined to shut them up altogether; and it seemed to them that the time had arrived to call in country Republicanism, which was of a more radical type than city Republicanism, to redress the balance. On Jan. 21, 1861, an order was introduced into the State Senate for the appointment of a joint special committee to consider the expediency of amending the charter of Boston so that its police should be appointed by the authorities of the State. While the order was under consideration, on January 24, the Antislavery Society held its annual meeting in Tremont Temple. The galleries and the rear of the hall were filled with persons who interrupted the proceedings by hisses and groans. The Mayor was called upon by the officers of the meeting to suppress the disturbance. He sent thirty policemen, but they made no serious effort to preserve order. Finally, on the written request of the trustees of the building, who feared injury to their property, the Mayor went to the meeting, accompanied by the chief of police, and under his instructions the galleries were cleared and order restored. As soon as he withdrew the disturbance was renewed, and the meeting was then adjourned until evening, with a view to having the admission to the hall regulated by tickets. Some of the disturbers announced their determination to remain in the building until the evening meeting was held; and the Mayor, being apprehensive of a riot, instructed the chief of police to clear the hall, close the doors, and prevent any meeting from being held in the evening. There was no such riotous spirit abroad as would justify such an arbitrary measure. The police might have preserved order if they had been properly instructed so to do by their superiors. After such an affair the proposition to place the control of the city police in the hands of the State authorities was favored by a good many persons who had no love for the Abolitionists. A committee of the General Court was appointed, and a great deal of testimony was taken in regard to the condition of the police force and the improper influences to which it was subjected by the mayor and aldermen; but although a precedent for the action proposed had been established by the New York Legislature, and had thus far worked well, the sentiment in favor of local self-government was too strong to be overcome even by the fervid rhetoric of the Antislavery leaders, and it was decided to let Boston manage her own affairs until her incapacity for so doing had been more fully demonstrated. The question was brought up several times in after years, but always with the same result.

Soon after the war broke out, the city was called upon to appropriate money for a variety of purposes not authorized by existing laws. To have

refused to appropriate the money on the ground of a want of authority would have seriously impeded the work of furnishing men and supplies for the army. It is to the credit of the city authorities, and especially of the Mayor, that they did not hesitate to take the responsibility of using the city's money to do whatever was necessary to minister to the comfort of the soldiers and of the soldiers' families. Many persons who received commissions to organize military companies had no means to provide quarters or subsistence for their recruits, and the Governor had no power at that time to establish camps where the volunteers might be maintained, drilled, and disciplined at the expense of the State. The city provided recruiting stations and paid for the subsistence of the men until they were mustered into the service of the United States. Uniforms and other clothing were also provided for the Boston volunteers; and regiments from other States, and from other portions of this State, passing through the city to the seat of war, were welcomed and refreshed on the Common or in Faneuil Hall. For these purposes about one hundred thousand dollars were expended from the city treasury during the year 1861. Among other measures instituted by the city council of 1861 for the benefit of the volunteers and their families was one which involved only a trifling expense to the city, but which was of incalculable value to the persons concerned. Arrangements were made by which the commanders of companies or regiments were enabled with little trouble to collect a portion of the money which their men received from the government paymaster and transmit it, without expense, to the mayor, to be deposited by him in a savings-bank, or paid to such persons as the soldier might designate. A very large amount of money was transmitted in this way, and many poor families had occasion to bless the Mayor for saving them from the necessity of receiving aid in a form which made them feel that they were objects of charity. In the following year the benefit of this system of allotments was extended by an act of the Legislature to the families of all the Massachusetts volunteers, the money being transmitted to the State treasurer, and by him distributed to the several city and town treasurers; but some of the Boston regiments continued to send their money directly to the Mayor until the close of the war, as it reached its destination more quickly in that way.

In his address to the city government at the beginning of 1862, the Mayor strongly recommended the erection of a new city hall. The subject had been before the city council many times during the preceding twelve years, but the two branches had not been able to agree either upon a site or upon the plans for a building. Although there was strong opposition to entering upon any new enterprises while the resources of the people were being so heavily taxed to maintain the national government, a majority of the city council this year voted to build a new hall on the site of the old one, at an estimated expense of $160,000, and the corner-stone was laid on Dec. 22, 1862.

The requisitions made in July of this year for men to serve in the army created almost a panic and led to the offer of heavy local bounties for volunteers. The city began by paying a bounty of one hundred dollars for men credited to its quota; and afterward, in order to compete with other municipalities which were offering much larger amounts, the payment was increased to two hundred dollars. The city was able to meet the demands made upon it without resorting to a draft; but by the end of the year nearly a million dollars had been expended in premiums for volunteers.

The election of December, 1862, resulted in the defeat of Mr. Wightman, and the reinstatement of Mr. Frederic W. Lincoln in the mayor's office.

The expenditures for war purposes during the years 1861 and 1862, although illegal and often extravagant, were never called in question by the people; but what they did question was the expediency of erecting public buildings, widening and extending streets, and spending the city's money on other works which, in view of the tremendous crisis through which the country was passing, might well be postponed. The expenditures for what is known as "city junketing" began to assume rather formidable proportions about this time, and to excite the comments of the taxpayers. Junketing is not a modern vice. It has been the custom from the earliest times for the city magistrates to have occasional feasts — or, as Washington Irving calls them, gormandizings — at the public expense; and so the name of alderman, originally used to designate the elderman, — the man of the highest wisdom and experience in the Teutonic community, — has come to be applied to the man of

"Fair round belly, with good capon lined."

But while the ancient alderman was satisfied with an occasional feast, his modern prototype seems filled with the desire to feast all the time; and the question as to the extent to which this desire should be gratified has frequently entered into the municipal elections in this city, and has sometimes determined the choice of a chief magistrate.

Mr. Lincoln was elected to bring the city government back to a more careful expenditure of the public money; and so well satisfied were the people with his efforts in that direction, that they continued him in office through four successive terms.

During the latter part of the year 1862 the cities and towns of the Commonwealth had engaged in a ruinous competition for men to fill their several quotas under the calls of the President for additional troops. The raising of money by taxation for the purpose of paying bounties was illegal, and might have been stopped at any time on the application of ten taxpayers to the highest court of the Commonwealth; but the local authorities were sustained by the great body of the people in almost any measure that was likely to avert a draft; and no man was willing, or rather no

man dared, to throw any obstacles in the way of procuring volunteers for the army. When the Legislature met in January, 1863, the Governor recommended that bounties should be equalized and assumed by the State, to be paid by a tax on the property and polls of all the people. An act was accordingly passed forbidding towns and cities from raising or expending money for the purpose of offering or paying bounties to volunteers under future calls of the President, and a State bounty of fifty dollars was offered in lieu of all local bounties. In the summer of 1863, the city having failed to meet the requisitions for men by voluntary enlistments, it was found necessary to resort to a draft. On the afternoon of July 14 two assistant provost marshals were serving notices upon the men who had been drafted for military service, and who lived in rather a disreputable quarter at the North End of the city, when they were suddenly assaulted by a woman whose husband was numbered among the conscripts. The cries of this infuriated woman acted like a preconcerted signal upon the people in the neighborhood. In an instant the narrow, crooked streets in the vicinity of the great manufactory of the Boston Gas-Light Company were filled with a mob of which women were the leaders, — the most frightful of all mobs. The marshals fled for their lives, and the local patrolmen, coming to their rescue, were set upon and beaten nearly to death. One gallant officer, a man of noble physique and of undaunted courage, attempted to make head against the terrible throng, but he was borne down, trampled upon, and maimed for life. The police rolls of the city still bear his name; and although he has never been able to do another day's service, no taxpayer grudges him the continued compensation of an active officer.

In a short time the whole North End of the city was in a state of revolt. The police of the First Division retreated into their station, which was threatened with assault. Then the city authorities saw that they had serious work on hand. For two days previous a portion of the city of New York had been under the control of a mob; and although there had been some indications of a disposition in this city to resist the enforcement of the draft, it was not believed that there would be any concerted resistance. It appeared afterwards that quite a formidable organization to resist the laws had been partially formed; but the leaders in that organization were probably as much taken by surprise at the sudden outbreak on the afternoon of the fourteenth as were the city authorities. Having taken possession of the streets at the North End, and surrounded the police station, the mob paused and awaited the next move of the city authorities. The composition of the mob was changed in the mean time. The men came from their work in the gas-house and elsewhere and took the places of the women. They purposed to test the question whether the Government had a right to drag them from their homes to fight in a cause in which they did not believe. The news of the great uprising in New York had been circulated among them, and its temporary success greatly stimulated their determination to resist. "I'd rather fight here, where I can go home to dinner," said one, "than in

the Southern swamps, where they don't have regular meals." But as a whole the assemblage was not a humorous one: it was taciturn, and took rather a serious view of the situation.

The Mayor was first informed of the disturbance by the marshal whose assistants had been mobbed. He was soon satisfied from the police reports which followed that extraordinary measures must be taken to preserve the peace. He acted with great promptness and resolution. There were only three local militia organizations in the city at that time: the independent company of Cadets (the prescriptive body-guard of the Governor), a battalion of cavalry, and a battery of light artillery. To these the Mayor issued his precepts, as authorized by the laws of the State, directing them to report to him forthwith, armed and equipped for service. This force was strengthened by several military organizations then in camp at Readville, preparing for service in the field, and by detachments from the heavy artillery and infantry companies on duty at the forts in the harbor. The Cooper-Street Armory, occupied by a light battery, was situated in the very midst of the riotous populace. The members of the local company had assembled quietly in the armory during the afternoon, without attracting much attention. It was about seven o'clock in the evening when a company of United States artillery from Fort Warren marched down into the disturbed quarter to join the local battery. It was hooted and hissed while on the way, but was allowed to enter the armory without serious opposition. Then the mob closed in around the building in a dense mass, and began to break the windows. A lieutenant of the light battery, who attempted to pass through the crowd, was beaten and trampled upon. The men sent out to rescue him could regain the armory only by firing and using their bayonets. Then the building was assaulted in earnest; the brick sidewalks and cobble-stone pavements were torn up and hurled against the doors. A citizen standing at one of the windows inside the armory was killed by a pistol-shot. Just as the mob was about to effect an entrance through the front doors, which they had partially battered down, a loaded cannon was fired from within. Its charge tore through the mass and demolished a part of the opposite house-front. There was a moment's pause, and then the attack was renewed; but the firing of the infantry from the windows and doors dampened the ardor of the assailants, and a diversion was presently created by the proposition to sack Reed's gun-store, in Dock Square. In the mean time, the other militia organizations had been brought together, and were about to march to the Cooper-Street Armory, with the Mayor at their head, when word was received of the movement in the direction of Dock Square. A plan of the Square as it existed at that time, with the great number of narrow streets and lanes radiating from it, bears a very close resemblance to the centre of a spider's web. If the rioters had obtained arms from the numerous gun-shops in the neighborhood, and established themselves in this spot, they might, with intelligent leaders, have held the approaches against a greatly superior force; but as they came pouring in from the North End,

they were met by an advance guard of policemen, who held them in check until the Mayor with his military force came up and effectually dispersed them. One gun-store was broken into and a considerable quantity of arms taken; but the men who took them were scattered before they could make use of their weapons.

That was the end of the famous draft-riot in Boston. The whiff of grape-shot at the Cooper-Street Armory and the repulse at Dock Square disheartened the rioters. Those who had been drafted concluded that it would be less hazardous to fight the Southern rebels than to fight Mayor Lincoln. There were some slight disturbances in different sections of the city during the succeeding twenty-four hours, and a considerable portion of the military force was kept on duty for several days; but the spirit of the mob had been effectually crushed before midnight of the fourteenth. The number of rioters killed is unknown, as the bodies were in most cases conveyed away secretly and buried without any official permit.

There was no further attempt to obstruct the operation of the Conscription Act. Of the twenty-six thousand one hundred and nineteen [1] men furnished by Boston for service in the army and navy, it appears that only seven hundred and thirteen were drafted. In the year 1864 the city obtained, through an act of Congress, credit for a large number of men who had enlisted in the navy since the beginning of the war; and although that gave a surplus of about five thousand men to offset any future requisitions, recruiting was continued with unabated zeal until the end.

In 1864 an important and a much needed improvement was made in the municipal organization for the relief of the poor. Under the provisions of the first city charter one person was elected in each ward of the city to be an overseer of the poor, and the persons thus chosen constituted the board of overseers, with all the powers formerly exercised by the town board. In the administration of their department they claimed the right to spend money to any extent and in any manner they saw fit. Grocers, coal-dealers, and others got elected on the board for the sole purpose of furnishing, either directly or indirectly, the articles for which the city paid. Mayor Quincy attempted in 1824 to obtain additional legislation by which the doings of the board would be brought under the supervision of the city council, but he failed; and his successors who afterward renewed the attempt failed, for the reason that the people could not be made to understand why the persons elected by them to the board of overseers were not as trustworthy as those elected to the city council. The change effected in 1864 was due

[1] The Mayor in his message to the City Council, at the beginning of the year 1866, gives this as the total number of men furnished by Boston, as far as ascertained, at that date: army, seventeen thousand one hundred and seventy-five; navy, eight thousand nine hundred and forty-four. The several organizations in which they enlisted are given in the appendix to the message. (*City Document* No. 1, 1866.) I have not been able to find either in the city clerk's office or the adjutant-general's office anything more complete or accurate than the statement furnished by the Mayor. [See General Palfrey's chapter on "Boston Soldiery," in the present volume, and Schouler's *History of Massachusetts in the Civil War*. — ED.]

more, perhaps, to Alderman Norcross than to any other person. As the chairman of a committee which investigated the subject in 1862, he exposed the loose and irresponsible methods of the old board so effectually that the city council petitioned the General Court for authority to appoint the overseers and to audit their accounts. An act giving that authority was passed April 2, 1864; and the new board, composed of honest and capable men, was organized July 4 following, with Robert C. Winthrop as chairman.

On September 18, 1865, the city government took possession of the new City Hall, on School Street, and listened to an admirable address by Mayor Lincoln. Since January, 1863, the mayor, the city council, and some of the heads of departments had occupied the building belonging to the Massachusetts Charitable Mechanics' Association, on the corner of Chauncy and Bedford streets. The new hall was well fitted for the accommodation of the government of that day; but the growth of the city has since made it necessary to hire outside offices for many of the departments.

On April 4, 1865, an act was passed by the Legislature authorizing the city to build the new reservoir, since known as the Chestnut Hill Reservoir. This enlargement of the water-works became necessary to save the water which was wasted at the lake when it overflowed, and to have a larger supply than the Brookline reservoir to draw from in case of accident to the aqueduct. The cost of this work, including the handsome driveway which was constructed around the reservoir, was $2,450,000. The city was also authorized the same year to cut a street through Fort Hill. This led to the entire removal of the hill. Washington Square, which crowned its summit, — once an attractive green spot, surrounded by the fine houses of wealthy residents, — had come to be a turfless, unwholesome piece of ground, surrounded by tenement houses of the lowest class. The work of cutting through the street was begun Oct. 15, 1866, and the whole elevation was removed by July 31, 1872. The amount of earth carried off, — partly by an elevated railroad, to fill Atlantic Avenue and the docks on the landward side, and partly by carts, to raise the grade of the territory which had had its drainage impaired by the filling of the Back-Bay basin, — was five hundred and forty-seven thousand six hundred and twenty-eight cubic yards. The total cost of the improvement was $1,575,000. The mayor and aldermen had extraordinary powers from the General Court to take private property and assess the damages.

In the year 1866 the Legislature gave the city what it had been long praying for, — that is, power to lay out, widen, and grade streets, and to assess upon each of the estates abutting on such streets a sum not exceeding half the amount which the estate is benefited by the improvement. Previous to the passage of this act the street widenings in the old portion of the city had generally been made by taking portions of estates where the owners had given notice of intention to build. By pursuing this policy the expense of paying for buildings and for breaking up the occupants' business was saved; but it was nevertheless a very expensive way of doing the work.

as the assessments for damages on account of taking property in that way were generally very heavy, and the city was unable to get the benefit of the widening in the increased value of the property for purposes of taxation until the improvement was completed. The whole amount expended by the city for laying out, widening, and extending streets, from June 1, 1822, to May 1, 1880, was $26,691,495.85. Had the city government steadily adhered to the "prospective plans for the improvement of the streets," adopted in 1825 under the administration of Mayor Quincy, a considerable portion of this enormous expense would have been saved.

In the charter election of December, 1866, Otis Norcross,[1] the Republican candidate, was successful, receiving nine hundred more votes than his Democratic opponent, Dr. Nathaniel B. Shurtleff. Mr. Norcross held the office of mayor only one year. His failure to receive the customary re-election for a second term was due, perhaps, to a certain stiffness of virtue, which, in political life at least, seldom receives the reward it merits. His administration is chiefly to be commended for what it did *not* do. It fell upon a time when some very sensible people were congratulating the country on the blessing of being in debt, and when municipal aid was sought and often granted for the promotion of private enterprises. A great number of projects, involving the expenditure of millions of dollars, were under consideration when Mr. Norcross took office; and had he not been a man of considerable firmness, one who had an intelligent idea of the scope and purpose of municipal government, and old-fashioned notions concerning municipal indebtedness, the city would have been committed to some enterprises of very doubtful expediency. Among other measures which claimed the attention of the government was one for the improvement of the flats on the northerly shore of South Boston, extending from Fort Point Channel to Castle Island. The improvement was intended partly for the benefit of the harbor, by deepening the ship-channel and increasing the movement of the water therein, so as to prevent it from shoaling, and partly for the direct benefit of commerce, by providing additional facilities for the delivery at deep water of freight from the West. It was proposed that the city should enter into a contract with the Commonwealth to fill these flats, build docks, streets, sewers, and bridges, and reimburse itself by the sale of the property to corporations and individuals. It was a magnificent scheme, but the Mayor did not believe that the city ought to undertake to carry it out alone. He endeavored, and successfully, to secure the

[1] Mr. Norcross was the descendant of Jeremiah Norcross, who came to this country in 1638, and shortly afterward settled at Watertown. He was born in Boston Nov. 2, 1811, and was educated at private schools and at the Boston high school. At the time of his election he was one of the leading merchants of the city. He possessed a thorough knowledge of municipal affairs, having been a director of the house of correction, a member of the school committee, president of the water board, treasurer to the overseers of the poor, and for three years (1862–1864) a member of the board of aldermen. In all these positions he performed services of lasting value to the city, by introducing better business methods, and raising the standard of official duty.

co-operation of all the parties interested, — the State, the city, and the railroad corporations which desired additional terminal facilities. Had the city undertaken to do the whole work, it would have been called upon to spend an enormous amount of money, and the property would probably have been thrown upon the market, before it could be utilized so as to cover the cost of the improvement.[1]

In his inaugural address the Mayor called attention to the unhealthy condition of the territory lying south of the Public Garden, caused by the want of suitable drainage. This territory was on the border of the Back Bay, and had been built upon before a grade was established, and when there was a right of drainage into a basin in which the water did not rise more than three feet above low-water. The filling of the basin by the Commonwealth and the Water-Power Company made it necessary to extend the sewers to points where the natural rise of the tide prevented the sewers from discharging their contents during the greater part of the day. The drainage of the whole territory lying west of Washington Street, between the Public Garden and the Roxbury line, was injuriously affected by the Back Bay improvement; but it was only within the district lying between Boylston Street and Dover Street, which had been built upon many years before any scheme for filling the adjoining flats had been seriously considered, that the injury was of a character to call for immediate action. The householders in that locality thought that the city should bear all the expense of providing suitable drainage, but the city authorities took the ground that the estates should be assessed for a portion of the benefit which would accrue from raising the grade of the territory. The subject had been discussed for some years, and with much bitterness. Mr. Norcross recommended an application to the Legislature for special authority to abate the nuisance and to recover a portion of the expense for so doing. His recommendation was adopted; and an act was passed during the session of 1867 giving the city authority to take that portion of the territory known as the Church-Street District, raise the grade, and either reconvey the several estates to their former owners upon payment of certain expenses, or sell them to the highest bidder. The act contained provisions new to the legislation of the State; but it was drawn with great care by an eminent jurist, and it enabled the city to carry out a great sanitary improvement without hardship to the numerous individuals whose property was taken, and without large expense to the city. In the following year the provisions of the act were extended to the territory known as the Suffolk-Street District, thereby covering all the low territory lying between the Public Garden and Dover Street. The net cost to the city of carrying out these improvements amounted to $2,558,745. Forty-seven acres of territory, occupied by one thousand two hundred and thirty buildings, and two thousand one hundred and fifty-five families, were included within the provisions of the legislative acts. The streets, alleys, and back-yards were

[1] The plan of improvement which was adopted is described in the chapter on "Boston Harbor."

raised to the grade of eighteen feet above mean low-water; the cellars were raised to the grade of twelve feet; and the buildings were raised to correspond to the grade of the streets. It took four hundred and five thousand three hundred and four cubic yards of gravel, mostly brought from the country by steam power, to do the filling. The work was not entered upon until June, 1868, after Mr. Norcross had gone out of office; and it was not completed until 1872.

Near the close of the year 1867 the city council passed orders approving certain plans for the erection of a new hospital for the insane, on a lot of land purchased for the purpose several years before in the town of Winthrop. The hospital at South Boston, erected in 1839, and enlarged in 1846, was reported by the directors for public institutions to be overcrowded at times, and to be lacking in many of the conveniences which medical experts deemed essential to the proper care of the insane. The Mayor, while recognizing the need of some improvements in the accommodations furnished to the city's patients, was strongly opposed to the erection of a hospital on the exposed headland at Winthrop, and was opposed to the erection, on any site, of a building projected on the magnificent plans which had received the approval of the city council. He vetoed the orders, and saved the city from building and maintaining a very expensive institution which it was clearly the duty of the State to provide, and which the State did provide some ten years later.

Among the notable events of this year was the annexation of the city of Roxbury to Boston. The subject had long been under consideration. Commissioners appointed by the governments of the two cities in 1866 to confer upon the subject reported early in 1867 in favor of the project, and on June 1 the Legislature passed an act, to take effect upon its acceptance by a majority of the voters in the two cities, providing that all the territory then comprised within the limits of Roxbury, with the inhabitants and estates therein, should be annexed to and made a part of the city of Boston and the county of Suffolk, and should be subject to the same municipal regulations, obligations, and liabilities, and entitled to the same immunities in all respects as Boston. On the second Monday in September the inhabitants of the two cities voted to accept the act,[1] and on the first Monday in January following Roxbury became a part of Boston, constituting the thirteenth, fourteenth, and fifteenth wards.

Roxbury at the time of its annexation contained about thirty thousand[2] inhabitants, and real and personal property valued for purposes of taxation at $26,551,700. Most of the wealthy residents had their places of business in Boston; and the controlling argument for annexation in this case, and in the case of other municipal corporations subsequently annexed, was that many men doing business in Boston were forced by its limited area to live

[1] Boston: yeas, 4,633; nays, 1,059. Roxbury: yeas, 1,832; nays 592. [See Mr. Drake's chapter in the present volume. — Ed.]

[2] Twenty-eight thousand four hundred and twenty-six, by the census of 1865.

outside of the city, and to lose the privilege of voting on questions of local government where they had the larger interest. Another argument in favor of the union, and one which had some influence probably, was that the relations between the two municipalities had recently become much more intimate through the occupation of the territory reclaimed from the sea on both sides of the narrow neck of land which had formerly united them by only a very slender tie.

The municipal election held on Dec. 9, 1867, resulted in the choice of Dr. Nathaniel Bradstreet Shurtleff, the Democratic candidate, for mayor, who received about five hundred more votes than Mr. Norcross. Dr. Shurtleff[1] had long sought the office of mayor, but not, it may be said, from any unworthy motives. He had spent a great deal of time in the study of the early institutions of the New England colonies, and had a very intimate and peculiar knowledge of Boston, its history, its traditions, its government, and its people. To be the chief magistrate of the town he knew so well, and for which he had the love that an antiquary feels for the subject of his studies, seemed to him a very great distinction. His fellow-citizens, recognizing his sincerity of purpose, kept him in the office for three terms, although he lacked the more important qualifications for a good executive. The constitution of his mind was so peculiar that long contact with men and affairs failed to give him any real knowledge of human character, or of the proper methods of government. He took considerable pride in the fact that he was the first mayor of Boston who had always belonged to the Democratic party; and it appears that he is the only mayor of Boston, up to the present day, who can claim that distinction. Mr. Wightman, Mr. Gaston, Mr. Cobb, and Mr. Prince, who belonged to the Democratic party at the time of their election, had formerly been members of the Whig party. But it cannot be said that Dr. Shurtleff used the office to further the interests of any political organization. He gave so little satisfaction to his party associates that they opposed his re-election for a third term, and he was taken up and elected by the Citizens, who saw in the Democratic opposition an element dangerous to good government.

His administration was marked by considerable activity on the part of the city government, especially in the matter of widening and extending streets in the business portion of the city. In 1868 Atlantic Avenue was laid out across the docks between Fort Point Channel and the East Boston Ferry ways, covering almost exactly the site of the ancient "barricado,"[2] which connected the north battery with the south battery, or Sconce. The cost of this improvement amounted to nearly two and a half million dollars. In 1869 Broadway, the main thoroughfare through South Boston, was extended across Fort Point Channel to Albany Street, at an expense of

[1] He was born in Boston on June 29, 1810, and graduated at Harvard College in 1831. A brief memoir of Dr. Shurtleff, by C. C. Smith, is printed in the *Mass. Hist. Soc. Proc.*, December, 1874, p. 389.

[2] [See Vol. II., p. 502. — ED.]

nearly a million dollars; and Federal Street, which had long been the principal thoroughfare from the old portion of the city to South Boston, was widened at an expense of about half a million dollars. These improvements were made necessary by the rapid growth of South Boston. During the ten years between 1860 and 1870, the population of that division of the city had increased more than fifty per cent, and the taxable value of property had more than doubled.

A similar development had been going on in East Boston during the same period. For many years there had been great dissatisfaction with the accommodations furnished by the corporations which operated the ferries between East Boston and the city proper. The People's Ferry Company, chartered in 1853, conveyed all its property, except its boats and franchise, to the city in 1859. The interest on the amount paid for the property was in the nature of a subsidy to the company; but owing to the bad location of the ferry landings, and to bad management on the part of the directors, the ferry did not pay its running expenses, and in 1864 the boats were withdrawn and sold, and the city took possession of the ferry-ways, which it had purchased in 1859. The East Boston Ferry Company was chartered in 1852, and, having obtained possession of the ferry landings most convenient for public travel, was enabled to do a business which gave it a small return on the capital invested. But the people of East Boston were unwilling that any corporation should make money out of the highway which, as they said, they were obliged to use in going from their homes to pay their taxes at the City Hall. The large amount of money expended for bridges to South Boston was used as an argument in favor of establishing a free bridge or free ferries to East Boston. In 1868 the Legislature chartered a company to build a bridge over tidewater between the ferry landings; but the United States authorities interposed to prevent the project from being carried out, as a bridge would have obstructed the passage of war vessels to and from the Navy Yard at Charlestown. In 1869 the city entered into a contract with the East Boston Ferry Company to purchase its franchise and property for the sum of $275,000; and on April 1, 1870, the city government took possession of the ferry, and has since operated it through the agency of a board of directors elected by the city council. The tolls are fixed by the board of aldermen, at a rate which pays a little more than the actual running expenses.

On June 4, 1869, the inhabitants of Dorchester and Boston voted to accept an act of the Legislature uniting the two corporations;[1] and on the first Monday in January following the ancient town, which received its name in the same order of the court of assistants that gave Boston its name and its corporate existence, became the sixteenth ward of the city. The State census of 1865 gave Dorchester a population of ten thousand seven hundred and seven; and the national census of 1870 gave the same terri-

[1] Vote of Boston: yeas, 3,420; nays, 565. Dorchester: yeas, 928; nays, 726. [See Mr. Barrows' chapter on "Dorchester in the Last Hundred Years," in the present volume. — Ed.]

tory a population of twelve thousand two hundred and fifty-nine. The old town organization was maintained in all its strength and purity up to the time of the union with the city. Most of the inhabitants belonged to the well-to-do class, who had an interest alike in their native town and in the city to which they resorted for business. The valuation of the real and personal property in Dorchester for purposes of taxation in 1869 amounted to $20,315,700.

The valuation of property in the whole city on May 1, 1870, amounted to $584,089,400, an increase of $307,228,400 during the previous decade, or 110.96 per cent. The total funded debt of the city at that date amounted to $18,687,350.91. The total tax levy made on May 1, 1870, amounted to $8,636,862, an increase of $6,106,862 since 1860; and the rate of taxation had risen during the same period from $8.99 to $13.65 on $1,000. The ninth census of the United States, taken on June 1, 1870, gave the city a population of 250,526, divided as follows: native males, 79,599; native females, 82,941; foreign males, 40,318; foreign females, 47,668

By an act of the Legislature of 1870 an important amendment was made to the city charter. All the powers formerly vested in the board of aldermen, in relation to laying out, altering, or discontinuing streets or ways in the city, were transferred to a board of street commissioners, consisting of three persons, elected by the qualified voters of the city for a term of three years, one to be elected each year. By subsequent enactments the powers of the board have been somewhat curtailed. Where the estimated expense of the street improvement exceeds $10,000, the concurrence of the city council is necessary to make the action of the commissioners binding; and by a two-thirds vote of the members of each branch, the city council may require the commissioners to lay out, alter, or discontinue any street. The power to abate taxes was also transferred from the aldermen to the commission. The establishment of this board was the beginning of some important changes in the organization of the city government. In the original organization the aldermen took the place of the selectmen, constituting the executive board of the government, of which the mayor was the chief officer. They also formed one branch of a council which took the place of the town-meeting. The legislative and executive powers of the corporation were therefore united in the same body. This was well enough in a city of small size, with a homogeneous population; but in 1870 Boston had ceased to be a small city, and there was not that readiness on the part of the substantial men in the community to serve the city gratuitously which had been shown at an earlier day, when the service was less arduous, and when it was felt to be more of a neighborly office. The aldermen who happened to be in office, however, at the time any change was proposed by which their powers or duties would be curtailed, generally put themselves in opposition to it; and it was only when the departments which they administered were found unequal to any emergency, that they gave way to the popular demand for the transfer of their more important exec-

utive powers to persons specially selected for the purpose, and compensated for their services. These changes, and the influences by which they were brought about, will be described when I come to deal with the administrations under which they occurred.

The charter election on Dec. 12, 1870, resulted in the choice of William Gaston,[1] the Democratic and Citizens' candidate, for mayor, who received three thousand more votes than his Republican competitor, Mr. George O. Carpenter. An able lawyer, and a man of high character, Mr. Gaston had the respect of all classes in the community; but he lacked that essential requisite for a good executive, — determination. He made up his mind with great difficulty, and it required a painful effort for him to act on any new or important question. He held the office of mayor for two years, and would have been re-elected for a third term had not an emergency arisen calling for a more energetic chief magistrate.

The most important act of the city government during his administration was the adoption of an ordinance to establish a new board of health. The city charter vested in the city council ample powers for the preservation of the public health, and authorized them to constitute either branch, or any committee of their number, or any other persons appointed for the purpose, a board of health for all or for particular purposes. For many years the aldermen had constituted the board of health, and the chief executive officer of the health department was elected annually by the city council. In cases of emergency, such as the prevalence of contagious or infectious diseases, the aldermen were aided by a board of consulting physicians, who were also elected by the city council, and who, like the aldermen, received no compensation for their services. As the city increased in size many important questions affecting the public health were constantly arising, — questions which the aldermen were not competent to deal with; but they were slow to recognize their incompetency, and were quick to take offence at the advice tendered by their medical assistants. As a consequence, the leading physicians refused to serve in a position where they had no power to carry out the measures which they recommended; and the aldermen soon found themselves losing the respect and confidence of the community. In the year 1871 a joint committee appointed to investigate certain complaints relating to the sale of unwholesome meat found that there were no proper restrictions upon the introduction of bad meat into the city markets, and that the health of the inhabitants was endangered by the want of an efficient board of health. In

[1] Mr. Gaston was the descendant of a Huguenot family that came to this country in the first half of the eighteenth century; and was born in South Killingly, Conn., on Oct. 3, 1820. He was graduated at Brown University, Providence, R. I., in 1840, and began the practice of law in Roxbury in 1846. He was a member of the common council of that city five years (1849–53), and its president two years (1852–53); was city solicitor five years (1856–60), and mayor two years (1861–62). He had formerly been a member of the Whig party, but the Antislavery agitation had carried him, with many of his eminent associates of the bar, into the Democratic ranks.

his address to the city council, at the beginning of 1872, Mr. Gaston urged the passage of an ordinance to establish an independent board; and his recommendation was enforced later in the year by the neglect of the aldermen to take any effective measures to check the small-pox, which prevailed to an alarming extent. The aldermen were unable to withstand the force of public opinion, and on December 2 an ordinance was passed authorizing the mayor to appoint, with the approval of the city council, three persons to constitute the board of health, to serve for a term of three years each. As a sort of compromise, the duty of cleaning the streets and cesspools, and collecting offal and ashes, — the work in which a considerable number of laborers were employed, — was placed under the charge of a joint committee of the city council. The appointment of a superintendent of health, a city physician, and a port physician, was given to the new board, but the exercise of this power was subject to the approval of the mayor. Mr. Gaston failed to make any appointments on the board before retiring from office, and the duty of carrying the ordinance into effect devolved upon his successor.

In the year 1871 the supply of water from Lake Cochituate was found to be insufficient for the growing wants of the city, and a competent engineer was appointed to make an examination of all sources of supply within fifty miles of Boston. This examination resulted in an application to the Legislature the following year for authority to take water from Sudbury River and Farm Pond. The authority was granted, and a temporary connection was immediately made between Sudbury River and Lake Cochituate, which furnished an adequate supply during the summer of 1872; but this connection could not be made permanent without interfering with the privileges of the mill-owners along the line of the river; and it became a serious question for the government to consider, whether the need for an additional supply of pure water was so imperative as to justify the very heavy expense which would be involved by taking all the waters of the river, within or above Framingham, as authorized by the act of the Legislature. During the unusually dry season of 1874, a temporary connection was made with the Mystic water works, which supplied Charlestown; but it was soon found that the connection could not be maintained without depriving Charlestown and its dependents of an adequate supply; and on Jan. 2, 1875, orders were passed authorizing the Cochituate water board, as the agent of the city, to take the waters of Sudbury River and Farm Pond and conduct them by a separate conduit to Chestnut Hill Reservoir, a distance of eighty-three thousand nine hundred and twelve feet. The city is now receiving from this source a supply equal to twenty million gallons daily, which can be doubled by the construction of additional storage basins. The cost of the additional supply has already amounted to over $5,000,000; and the entire cost of the Cochituate and Sudbury works on April 30, 1880, amounted to $16,341,908.25. The cost of constructing the Mystic works amounted at that date to $1,614,648. The average daily

consumption of water during the year 1879 amounted to 34,579,370 gallons, of which 8,883,470 were drawn from Mystic Lake, and 25,695,900 from Cochituate Lake and Sudbury River.

In 1871 the Legislature established a new department in the city government, known as the Department for the Survey and Inspection of Buildings. The chief officer is appointed by the mayor, with the approval of the city council, for a term of three years; and the assistant inspectors and clerk are appointed by the chief officer with the approval of the mayor. The department had been organized but a few months when the great fire of 1872 occurred, and at the extra session of the Legislature which followed, the provisions of the building law were greatly modified with a view to prevent the use of combustible materials in the construction of buildings within certain limits to be prescribed from time to time by the city council.

A description of the great fire does not fall within the scope of this chapter, therefore I shall refer to it only so far as may be necessary to show the effect it had upon the city government. There was a good deal of dissatisfaction with the management of the fire department during the fire, and this dissatisfaction subsequently found expression in the defeat of the Mayor when nominated for another term, and in the reorganization of the department. It is natural that the people should hold the chief executive of the government largely responsible for the efficiency of the executive departments under him, although by the letter of the law he may have little or no control over them. Mayor Quincy (the senior) was quick to see that if anything went wrong in any department of the government (the mayor's duties were then partly legislative and partly executive) he would be held accountable, and he felt that the people were right in holding him accountable. Therefore he made the "glittering generalities" concerning the powers of the executive "blazing ubiquities." By the charter of 1854 the powers of the mayor — especially in the matter of controlling legislation — were somewhat curtailed; but still there is enough in the general powers given him as the chief executive officer of the corporation, and in the injunction "to be vigilant and active at all times in causing the laws for the government of the city to be duly executed and put in force," to justify the people in looking to him for such prompt and energetic action as the emergency may call for. Mr. Gaston failed to make his paramount authority as chief executive felt, not only in the case of the great fire, but in the measures taken to check the terrible disease from which, for want of suitable sanitary precautions, many lives were sacrificed during the last months of his administration. While, therefore, his general policy in the management of the city affairs was approved by all classes, the lack of energy shown in these two instances raised a strong opposition to his retention in office; and at the election on Dec. 10, 1872, Henry Lillie Pierce,[1] who was nominated

[1] Mr. Pierce, the descendant of an English family that settled in Watertown in 1638, was born in Stoughton, Mass., Aug. 23, 1825. He received his education in the public schools of his native town and in the academy at Milton, and the academy and normal school at Bridgewater. Although actively engaged in business since the twenty-fifth year of his age, he has

by the Republicans on a non-partisan platform, received a plurality of seventy-nine votes.

Mr. Pierce brought to the mayor's office not only good business principles and an intimate knowledge of municipal affairs, but an ability for dealing with public questions very rare among men not specially trained for office. In his inaugural address he recommended the reorganization of the fire and health departments, and the revision of the city charter. He did not content himself merely with recommending these measures which he thought essential to the good government of the city; he had that sense of responsibility in seeing them carried out which is the chief requisite of a good executive. Within ten days after taking office he organized a new board of health, and took effective measures to check the loathsome disease from which the people were dying at the rate of about fifty a week. The reorganization of the fire department met with strong opposition. The movement was made to appear as a sort of reflection on the conduct of the members during the great fire. Now the firemen had behaved on that occasion with characteristic spirit and bravery, but for want of an intelligent head their efforts were badly directed. Many of them, however, did not appreciate this, and they made the cause of their chief their own. Had it not been for another serious fire on May 30, 1873, which went far to destroy the public confidence in the management of the department, it is hardly probable that the Mayor's recommendation could have been carried out. It required no additional legislation on the part of the State to enable the city council to place the department under a paid commission, and on October 24 an ordinance was passed giving the mayor authority to appoint, with the approval of the city council, three fire commissioners, to hold office for three years each. The duty of extinguishing fires and protecting life and property in case of fire, was intrusted to these commissioners; and to enable them to perform their duty in the most efficient manner, they were authorized to appoint all other officers and members of the department and fix their compensation. The Mayor lost no time in carrying the ordinance into effect, and a considerable reduction in the rates of insurance soon testified to the efficiency of the new organization.

The recommendation for a revision of the city charter was also strongly opposed, on the ground that it looked to a centralization of power; but the mayor was finally authorized to appoint a commission to consider the subject. Benjamin R. Curtis, the eminent jurist, accepted the position of chairman, but he died before the work was entirely completed; and his place was filled by George Tyler Bigelow, formerly Chief-Justice of the Supreme

always taken a deep interest in public affairs. The pro-slavery course of the Democratic party, to which he originally belonged, led him in 1848 to join in the organization of the Free Soil party, and afterward to become an active member of the Republican party. He was a member of the Legislature for four years (1860–62, 1866); and on the annexation of Dorchester to Boston he was chosen to represent that part of the city (where he had long been a resident) in the board of aldermen during the two years ending 1870–71.

Court. In their report, submitted at the beginning of the year 1875, the commissioners said: —

"The lapse of half a century since the adoption of the first charter has wrought great changes in the city and in its municipal affairs. Its population in 1822 was only a little more than forty thousand. It now contains upward of three hundred and forty thousand. Its territory at that time embraced an area of about two thousand acres; now it includes more than twenty-one thousand five hundred acres. Its valuation in 1822 amounted only to about forty-two million; in 1874 it rose to upward of eight hundred million. The change has not been merely in the extent of its territory, the number of its inhabitants, and the amount of its taxable property. The character of its population has greatly changed. Instead of a small, compact community, the leading citizens of which were well known to each other, it has become a large metropolis, with a population spread over a large extent of territory, divided into numerous villages, widely separated, having but few interests in common, and the inhabitants of which are but little known to each other. With these changes have come their natural consequences. Many institutions, public works, and organizations have grown up or been established, such as the public exigencies require, and which have added largely to the duties of the public officers of the city, essentially changed their character, and rendered their administration more difficult and complicated. . . . It would seem to be clear that duties so numerous and important cannot be properly superintended and managed by persons who render gratuitous services only, or who are chosen to office not for their experience in the duties which they may be called to perform, or their peculiar fitness and skill in the work of the different departments which they may have in charge."

The draft of a new charter, which the commissioners submitted with their report, provided that the mayor and the members of the city council should hold office for three years; that the city council should have entire control over all appropriations of the public money and the purposes for which it is expended; that the heads of the several executive departments should be appointed by the mayor with the approval of the city council; and that the school committee should be reduced to two members from each ward. Some of the recommendations made by the commissioners have since been carried out, but the report as a whole never received the approval of the city council.

Among other important matters which engaged the attention of the city government during the year 1873 were the street improvements within the district covered by the great fire of the previous year. The cost of these improvements amounted to over five million dollars. The old streets were so narrow and crooked that it was at first proposed to lay out the territory on an entirely new plan; but it was found on examination that the city could not give a good title to the land included in the old streets, and the improvement was, therefore, restricted to the widening and straightening of the old ways.

The city council of this year also passed an order requesting the trustees of the Public Library to open the reading-room connected with that institu-

tion on certain hours every Sunday. Similar orders, passed in 1865 and 1872, had been vetoed by the mayors then in office, partly on the ground that the law officer of the city was of the opinion that the opening would be a violation of the statute relating to the observance of the Lord's Day, and partly on the ground that it was contrary to public policy. Mr. Pierce was heartily in favor of the measure; and with his approval it was carried into effect, and its wisdom has hardly been questioned since.

The boundaries of the city were considerably enlarged this year by the annexation of Charlestown, West Roxbury, and Brighton.[1] At the election in November, 1873, Mr. Pierce was chosen a member of the National House of Representatives to fill a vacancy in the third Congressional district, caused by the death of Mr. William Whiting. In order to take his seat in the House on the first Monday in December, he resigned the office of mayor; and in accordance with the provisions of the charter the duties were performed for the remainder of the year by Leonard R. Cutter, chairman of the board of aldermen.

At the municipal election in December Samuel Crocker Cobb[2] was chosen mayor for the ensuing year by a nearly unanimous vote. For the office of chief executive he was singularly well fitted, not only by experience in municipal affairs, but by a disposition in which great energy and courage were joined to high-bred courtesy and genial frankness. Although not specially identified with any political party, his sympathies, after the dissolution of the Whig party to which he originally belonged, were generally with the Democratic party on national questions. He was a firm believer, however, in a non-partisan administration of local affairs; and so well did he act up to his convictions in that matter, that the Citizens elected him for three successive terms, — the last time against the united opposition of the two leading political parties. During these three years (1874–76) a great many important measures were acted upon by the city government.

In his inaugural address the Mayor recommended the establishment of several public parks in different sections of the city, easily accessible to

[1] Charlestown at this time contained about 30,000 inhabitants, and covered an area of 586 square acres. Brighton contained about 5,000 inhabitants, and covered an area of 2,277 square acres. West Roxbury numbered about 9,000, and its territory embraced an area of 7,848 square acres. By the census of 1870 the population of Charlestown was 28,323; of Brighton, 4,967; of West Roxbury, 8,683. [See the chapters on "Charlestown," "Roxbury," and "Brighton," in the present volume. — Ed.]

[2] He was born in Taunton, Mass., on May 22, 1826, and was the descendant of an English family of good condition that settled in that town during the latter half of the seventeenth century. The paternal ancestor, Henry Cobb, emigrated to the Plymouth Colony as early as 1629, and settled at Barnstable, where he died in 1679, leaving seven sons. He was fitted for college at the Bristol Academy in Taunton, but came to Boston at the early age of sixteen, and engaged in the foreign shipping business, which he was following at the time he entered the mayor's office. He served as a member of the Roxbury board of aldermen in 1861–62; and after the annexation of that city in 1867 he was chosen as its first representative in the Boston board of aldermen. He also served as a member of the board of directors for public institutions from 1869 to the close of the year 1873.

the people. The subject of enlarging the public grounds had already received some attention. In 1869 the General Court passed an act providing for the appointment of a mixed commission, part by the State and part by the city authorities, with power to take lands and "lay out one or more public parks in or near the city of Boston." The act was not to take effect unless accepted by two-thirds of the inhabitants of Boston, who might exercise the right of voting on the question; and failing to receive the requisite number of affirmative votes, it became void. In accordance with the Mayor's recommendation a new application was made to the Legislature; and in 1875 an act was passed authorizing the mayor, with the approval of the city council, to appoint three park commissioners, with power to take lands, lay out public parks, and make rules for their government. The operations of the commissioners were restricted, however, by a provision in the act that no expenditures could be made by them, and no obligations entered into beyond the appropriations of money made from time to time by the city council. This act was duly accepted by the citizens on June 9, 1875, and the commissioners were appointed in the following month. Beyond preparing plans and estimates no action was taken by the commissioners until 1877, when, with the approval of the city council, they purchased one hundred and six acres of flats on the westerly side of the Back Bay, at the average price of ten cents per square foot. The assessments which they were authorized to levy on the adjoining lands, on account of their increased value from the establishment of the park, have made the net cost of the property to the city only about thirty thousand dollars. The commissioners have since recommended, and the city council has now under consideration, the purchase of a large tract of land in West Roxbury, the purchase of certain lands and flats at City Point, in South Boston, and the acquisition from the State of a strip of flats on Charles River, in the rear of Beacon Street and Charles Street, for an ornamental embankment and driveway. Connected to some extent with the park improvement, as a sanitary measure, was the plan for an intercepting sewerage system prepared by an able commission appointed by the Mayor in 1875. The plan was adopted in 1877, and an appropriation of $3,713,000 was made to carry it out. It involved the construction of about thirteen miles of intercepting sewers, the establishment of pumping works at Old Harbor Point, and a tunnel, under Dorchester Bay, to the outlet in deep water beyond Moon Island. The work has not yet (1880) been completed.

To carry on the important work of procuring an additional supply of water from Sudbury River, to which reference has already been made, the Mayor urged the appointment of a paid commission, organized on the same basis as the health and fire boards; and on the petition of the city council the Legislature of 1875 passed an act authorizing the appointment of such a commission, to be known as the Boston Water Board. The board was organized in the following year, and all the powers conferred by the statutes of the Commonwealth, in relation to supplying the city with water,

were delegated to it; but in the exercise of its powers the board is subject to the supervision of the city council.

In his first address the Mayor referred to the inability both of the State and the city police to execute the law prohibiting the sale of intoxicating liquors, and stated that he would "use all legal means to carry into effect a law which should have for its object the regulation and restraint of the liquor traffic." In the following year the Legislature passed a license law, and its execution in the city of Boston was given to a board of three license commissioners, appointed by the mayor and confirmed by the city council.

By an act of the Legislature passed in 1874 the mayor was authorized to appoint, subject to the approval of the board of aldermen, three persons to constitute a board of registrars of voters. Previous to that time the preparation of the voting lists had devolved upon the city clerk. There was much dissatisfaction with the manner in which the ward officers performed their duties of receiving, counting, and returning votes. The city charter provided for the annual election of a warden, clerk, and six inspectors, by the qualified voters in each ward. These offices were filled in many instances by persons who were barely able to read and write, and who were utterly incapable of properly performing the duties. The aldermen constituted the returning board for the city; and being called upon after every election to recount more or less of the votes, the grossest errors were often discovered in the ward returns. In 1876 the mayor was authorized, with the approval of the aldermen, to appoint three of the six inspectors of elections in each ward. By putting the responsibility for the selection upon the mayor, and increasing the term of office to three years, it was expected that an honest and intelligent discharge of the duties would be secured; but the reform did not go far enough; interested parties still controlled a majority of the ward officers. In 1878, therefore, on the petition of the city council, the Legislature passed an act authorizing the board of assessors of taxes to divide each ward of the city into voting precincts, containing as nearly as practicable five hundred registered voters; and, in addition to a warden and clerk elected by the inhabitants of the precinct, the mayor, with the approval of the aldermen, was authorized to appoint two inspectors, representing different political parties. Under this system it is comparatively easy to detect errors or frauds either in the registration of voters or in the returns of elections.

In 1875 the Legislature passed an important act to regulate and limit municipal indebtedness. It provided that cities and towns in this Commonwealth should not become indebted to an amount, exclusive of loans for water supply, exceeding in the aggregate three per centum on the valuation of their taxable property; but in any city or town where the indebtedness amounted, at the time the act was passed, to two per centum on its valuation, permission was given to increase the debt to the extent of an additional one per centum. At the time the act took effect this city was indebted

more than two per centum on its valuation (about two and three fifths), and was therefore authorized to increase the debt one per centum on its valuation of May 1, 1875, namely, $793,961,895. Any debts contracted for other purposes than constructing general sewers and supplying the inhabitants with pure water are made payable within a period not exceeding ten years, and the city is required to raise annually by taxation an amount sufficient to pay the interest as it accrues, and eight per centum of the principal until the sum raised is sufficient to extinguish the debt at maturity. Debts incurred in constructing sewers may be made payable at a period not exceeding twenty years; and for supplying water, at a period not exceeding thirty years. The Mayor seized the opportunity afforded by the passage of this act to urge upon the city council the policy of raising by taxation, annually, a sufficient amount of money to pay for all expenses incurred by the city, except for the enlargement of the water works. He was able to show that, if the government abstained from contracting new loans, the sinking funds already established would free the city from all except the water debt in eight years; but while the government was ready then, and indeed has at all times been ready, to applaud any general proposition looking to the reduction or extinction of the debt, its virtuous resolutions have seldom stood in the way of any scheme which seemed to meet the popular favor; and it may fairly be presumed that the indebtedness of the city will be kept very near the limit authorized by law.

Perhaps the most notable event of Mr. Cobb's administration, certainly the one which possesses the greatest historical interest, was the celebration of the one hundredth anniversary of the Battle of Bunker Hill. On the evening of June 16, 1875, there was a very remarkable meeting in Music Hall. Many of the men who had taken a leading part in the war of the Rebellion — rebel and patriot; the soldier of the Union and the soldier of the Confederacy — met for the first time in peace and with a common object,— the commemoration of the most important of the series of events which resulted in the creation of an independent nation. The Mayor's address of welcome was admirably adapted to the spirit of the meeting, and met with a very cordial response from the city's guests. On the following day there was a great procession, composed of various military and civic bodies, and an oration on the site of the historic battleground by Charles Devens, Jr., at that time a justice of the Supreme Court of the Commonwealth.

Mr. Cobb was succeeded in the mayor's office by Frederick Octavius Prince,[1] who was elected in December, 1876. He was the candidate of the Democratic party; and partly through the influence of the national election held the month previous, and partly through his own personal popularity, he received about five thousand more votes than his opponent,

[1] Mr. Prince came of a good family, long resident in Boston, where he was born Jan. 18, 1818. He was graduated at the Latin School in his native city and at Harvard College, and subsequently became a member of the Suffolk Bar.

Nathaniel J. Bradlee, who was not only the candidate of the Republican party but of the Citizens' organization. Mr. Prince had held no office in the city government previous to his election as mayor, and his knowledge of municipal affairs was somewhat limited; but his readiness and ability as a public speaker, and his tact and courtesy as the representative of the city, especially on festive occasions, have been accepted as an offset, to some extent, for any shortcomings in the business administration of the office. Having been elected as the special representative of a party, he found some difficulty in making the demands of his supporters agree with the best interests of the city; and he did not always succeed in doing so. It may be said, however, that he endeavored to carry out the policy of retrenchment inaugurated by his predecessor, and that during the first part of his administration his efforts in that direction were measurably successful. In 1874 the tax levy had reached the enormous sum of $12,000,000. The panic of 1873 had proved most disastrous to the owners of real estate, especially to a large class of speculators in the lands recently annexed to the city. The policy pursued by the local assessors of maintaining a high valuation of real property created much dissatisfaction, and there was a general demand not only for a reduction of valuations, but for a reduction of expenses. In response to this demand the city's expenses were reduced in 1875 and 1876 to the extent of $2,775,098; and the valuation of real estate was reduced in 1876 from $558,000,000 to $526,000,000. In 1877 a further reduction of over half a million dollars was made in the tax levy, without detriment to the public service, and the real estate valuation was reduced to $481,000,000; but the spirit of economy which prevailed at the beginning of this year did not continue to the end. An order was passed by the city council to run the East Boston ferries at the city's expense; and although the Mayor was informed by the city solicitor that the order was illegal, he gave it his approval. The opponents of the measure went to the supreme court, and obtained a writ of mandamus directing the city to continue to collect the tolls established by the board of aldermen. The appropriations for carrying out the plan for improved sewerage ($3,713,000), for erecting a new building for the English High and Latin schools ($350,000), and for a Back Bay park ($450,000),—measures initiated by previous city governments,—met with general approval.

When the time came for selecting candidates for the next city government, the dissatisfaction with Mr. Prince's administration found expression in a petition, signed by some twenty-five hundred tax-paying citizens "representing all parties and all classes," asking Mr. Henry L. Pierce, who had retired from Congress at the end of four years' service, to allow his name to be used as the Citizens' candidate for mayor. The call was too imperative to be disregarded; and Mr. Pierce stood as the candidate of the Citizens and also of the Republicans. Mr. Prince was renominated by the Democrats. There was a very bitter contest, which resulted in the

election of Mr. Pierce by a majority of about two thousand three hundred votes.

On taking office Mr. Pierce made an address to the city government, which was highly commended by the representatives of all parties. Referring to some of the schemes which had been devised for improving our local government by a limitation of the suffrage, or by transferring the more important duties to commissions appointed by the State authorities, he said: —

"While I am fully sensible of the defects in our present system of municipal administration, I cannot help regarding with distrust any scheme for curing them by a radical change of the New England system under which we have grown up, and which, notwithstanding its defects, has thus far produced better results than any other system that has been tried in this country. . . . It is hardly probable that a condition of things can arise in any city in New England where those who have an interest in maintaining order will be outnumbered by those who hope for some personal benefit by creating disorder; therefore, if those who have interests at stake will bestir themselves to protect their interests, — and there is no safety in any scheme which can be devised unless they do so, — they can better accomplish their purpose by outvoting their opponents than by undertaking to deprive them of privileges they now possess. In a recent argument in favor of extending household suffrage to the counties in England, Mr. Gladstone says the franchise is an educational power. The possession of it quickens the intelligence, and tends to bind the nation together. It is more important to have an alert, well-taught, and satisfied people than a theoretically good legislative machine."

The most important act of Mr. Pierce's second administration was the reorganization of the police department. The regular police force at this time consisted of seven hundred and fifteen men. They were appointed by the mayor with the approval of the aldermen, and held office during good behavior. The powers of the mayor, the aldermen, and the chief of police were not clearly defined, and in consequence the discipline of the department was very lax. Mayor Cobb, in his address to the city council of 1876, had strongly urged the appointment of a commission to administer the department; but the Democrats were at that time united in their opposition to the creation of any more "three-headed commissions," and there were some prominent Republicans who doubted the expediency of giving any more power to the mayor. While the feeling against commissions in general was not much changed during the two following years, the growing inefficiency of the police department was so clearly seen that when Mayor Pierce pointed out the improvements which had been made in the fire and health departments by putting them under commissions, and declared his belief that a like improvement would follow the appointment of a commission to have charge of the police department and the execution of the laws in relation to the sale of intoxicating liquors, public opinion forced the city council to give its sanction to the measure. An act was obtained from the Legislature authorizing the mayor, with the approval of the city council, to

appoint three commissioners to serve for a term of three years each. The appointments of the mayor were readily confirmed, and the commissioners organized on July 8, 1878.

A further reduction of nearly $900,000 was made in the tax levy of this year; so that, although the assessors made a reduction of seventeen million dollars in the valuation of property, the rate of taxation was reduced from $13.10 to $12.80 on a thousand.

At the end of the year Mr. Pierce declined a re-election; and Mr. Frederick O. Prince was again brought forward as the candidate of the Democrats. His opponent was Colonel Charles R. Codman, who was the nominee of the Citizens and Republicans. The feeling that Mr. Prince had been rather hardly pressed in the preceding election led to a sort of reaction in his favor, which returned him to office with a plurality of about seven hundred votes. There was a marked improvement in his administration during his second term, so that he had the partial endorsement of a Citizens' nomination for a third term, and was elected by a majority of about two thousand six hundred votes over Mr. Solomon B. Stebbins, the Republican candidate. During these last two years (1879–80), the time of the government has been occupied mainly in carrying out the important measures previously



AUTOGRAPHS OF THE MAYORS.



AUTOGRAPHS OF THE MAYORS.

adopted,—the improvement of the sewerage system, the construction of a park on the Back Bay, the enlargement of the water works, the construction of sewers in the Mystic valley to preserve the purity of the water supplied from that source, and the erection of a costly building for the English High and Latin schools. The most important among the new projects now (1880) under consideration are the establishment of public parks in West Roxbury, at South Boston Point, and on the banks of Charles River; and the erection of a new county court house, and public library building.[1] On Sept. 17, 1880, the city government celebrated the two hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the settlement of Boston. A bronze statue of John Winthrop,[2] which

[1] For the last named purpose the General Court of 1880 granted to the city, free of rent, a parcel of land containing about thirty-three thousand square feet, situated on the southerly corner of Dartmouth and Boylston streets; the only conditions being that the erection thereon of a library building should be begun within three years, and that the library should be open, under reasonable regulations, to all the citizens of the Commonwealth. [See the chapter on "Libraries" in Vol. IV. — Ed.]

[2] A heliotype of this statue is given in Vol. I. Jonathan Phillips, who died in July, 1860, bequeathed to the city of Boston $20,000 "as a trust fund, the income of which shall be annually expended to adorn and embellish the streets and public places of the city." On the recommendation of Mayor Cobb in 1875, the aldermen voted to use a portion of the income from the fund to erect a statue of Josiah Quincy. The order was given to Mr. Thomas Ball, and the statue was placed in front of the city hall, as a companion

had been erected in Scollay Square, was unveiled in the morning. Then followed commemorative services in the Old South Church, where the Mayor delivered an address of some length on the character and services of Winthrop;[1] and later in the day there was a great procession, the largest, it was said, that ever walked the streets of Boston.

And here the sketch of Boston "under the mayors" comes to an end. During the fifty-nine years that the city government has been established the population of Boston has increased from about 45,000 to 362,535; more than eight fold. About 215,000 persons live within the area covered by the first city charter; and 147,500 persons live on the territory which has been annexed since 1867. The current expenses of the city in 1822 amounted to $249,000; in 1880 the appropriations for current expenses, including interest on the city debt, amounted to $10,190,387, — a forty-fold increase. The valuation of property for purposes of taxation amounted in 1823 to $44,896,800; in 1880, to $639,462,495, — an increase of about fourteen-fold. The highest valuation of taxable property, $798,755,050, and the largest tax levy, $12,045,902, were in 1874, the second year after the great fire, which destroyed about seventy-five million dollars worth of property.

Of the twenty-three persons who have held the office of mayor of Boston, thirteen were born in the city; all of them were born in New England; eleven were graduates of Harvard College, and three were graduates of other colleges. Some of them have been men of distinction; most of them have been men of ability; no one of them has retired from office with any stain resting upon his character. The city has been fortunate in the character of the men who have served her, both in the legislative and executive departments of the government. The high standard of official integrity which has been maintained is largely due to the efforts of those citizens who have associated from time to time to resist the introduction of national party politics into the management of the city business. They have for many years held the balance of power between the two great political parties, and they have kept the leaders of both in wholesome fear of the consequences of making appointments to office for party purposes, or of using the city's money to promote party interests.



piece to the Franklin statue, and unveiled Oct. 11, 1879. See Mayor Prince's address, *City Document*, 115, 1879. In 1879 the aldermen contracted for copies in bronze of the two representative statues of Massachusetts in the capitol at Washington,—Samuel Adams, by Miss Anne Whitney, and John Winthrop, by Richard S. Greenough,—the expense of making them to be charged to the income from the Phillips Fund. The statue of Adams was unveiled July 4, 1880. See oration by Robert D. Smith, Esq., *City Document*, 103, 1880. A portion of the income from this fund was also used to beautify the lot of land at the junction of Columbus Avenue and Pleasant Street, on which there is the group emblematical of Emancipation, presented to the city in 1879, by Mr. Moses Kimball. See *City Document* 126, 1879.

[1] See *City Document*, 1880, containing a full account of the celebration, prepared by Mr. William H. Lee.

CHAPTER III.

BOSTON AND THE COMMONWEALTH UNDER THE CITY CHARTER.

BY HIS EXCELLENCY JOHN D. LONG, LL.D.,

Governor of Massachusetts.

THE subject of this chapter has its beginning in the presentation to the General Court of the following petition: [1] —

"The undersigned, being a Committee authorized and instructed by the Town of Boston, most respectfully represent —

"That the present size of the Town renders it impossible any longer to carry into effect the principles on which its present government is founded, as this is presumed to be exercised by the inhabitants at large, assembled in Town-meeting. There is no Hall in the Town capable of containing all the legal voters; and if such a room existed its dimensions would be too extensive to admit of wise conceit or true deliberation by the citizens. The duty of attending Town-meetings is therefore becoming more and more neglected; and a very small minority of persons now decide upon the public concerns of the whole community. The consequences are a want of unity, regularity, and responsibility in the management of the prudential affairs of the Town. The evils of such a state of things have been hitherto diminished by the intelligence, prudence, and integrity of the different Boards that have been separately entrusted with the management of various branches of Town affairs, yet no skill nor integrity can supply the deficiencies of the present system, which oblige the Town so frequently to trouble the Legislature with applications for minute local regulation. Trusting that the Town may continue to partake in the growing prosperity of the Commonwealth with which its own is so inseparably and entirely blended, the time must soon arrive when the inconveniences and losses incident to an impracticable form of government will be greatly and oppressively increased. The experience of actual disadvantages, together with a principle of foresight, have convinced a majority of the citizens that the present moment of calm in the public mind is a suitable one to adopt an alteration which will be not only a present relief, but a preventive remedy for dangerous tendencies. As the citizens of this State, with a view to this case, have recently made an amendment to the Constitution authorizing the erection of city governments, the

[1] [For the proceedings of the town leading to this petition, see Mr Bugbee's chapter next preceding. — Ed.]

necessity of some change, it would appear, has become obvious not only to the inhabitants of this Town, but to the majority of the Commonwealth.

"For the reasons thus briefly stated, we pray your honorable Body to establish a City Government for the Town of Boston.

"Boston, January 14, 1822.

Daniel Messinger.	William Sullivan.
Charles Jackson.	George Darricott.
Michael Roulston.	Gerry Fairbanks.
Isaac Winslow.	Thomas Badger.
George Blake.	James Daley.
Lemuel Shaw.	Henry Farnam.
W. Tudor.	William Sturgis.
	Lewis G. Pray.

This paper is endorsed as follows: —

"In House of Representatives, Jan. 15, 1822. Read and Com'd to the Committee on Incorporation of Towns, etc.

"Sent up for concurrence. Josiah Quincy, *Spkr.*

"In Senate, January 15, 1822. Read and concurred. John Phillips, *Presid't.*"

It is a notable fact that President Phillips became the first, and Speaker Quincy the second, mayor of the new city, — the former filling the office one year, and Mr. Quincy five years. Two other presidents of the Senate have also been mayors of Boston, — one of them, Harrison Gray Otis, president in 1808–10, and mayor in 1829–31; and the other, Josiah Quincy, Jr., president in 1842 and 1844, and mayor in 1846–48. Since then, two mayors of Boston have become governors of the Commonwealth, — Alexander H. Rice, mayor in 1856–57, and governor in 1876–78; and William Gaston, mayor in 1871–72, and governor in 1875. The roll of the Boston Common Council of 1853 contains the names of two men who subsequently rose to the chief magistracy of the State, — Henry J. Gardner and Alexander H. Rice. Chief-Justice Bigelow was a member of the Common Council from Ward Seven in 1843; and the Hon. Joseph A. Pond, president of the Senate in 1866–67, and the Hon. Charles R. Train, late attorney-general of the Commonwealth, saw service in the same body. Before he became mayor, the Hon. Henry L. Pierce was a member of the popular branch of the General Court; and the number of those is legion who have held under both governments less distinguished but honorable offices.

The reciprocal relations of Boston and the Commonwealth under the city charter, strictly interpreted, are purely official in their character, and form a subject of but narrow scope, differing in no principle from those existing between the Commonwealth and her other municipalities. Seeking them in the city charter itself, we find the inhabitants of Boston made a corporation at their own request, and the administration of their fiscal and prudential concerns vested in a mayor, a board of aldermen, and a common council. All the powers formerly vested in the selectmen, either by statute or by the usages, votes, or by-laws of the town, and also the powers of county com-

missioners, are given to the board of aldermen; and the aldermen and common council, acting concurrently as the city council, are endowed with authority to provide for the assessment and collection of taxes for all purposes for which towns may raise money, to appoint various executive officers, and even to make by-laws and ordinances, with fines for breach thereof. But these powers were by no means plenary, and with the increasingly rapid growth of the city came more and more frequent applications for fresh grants. So numerous did these become, that in 1870 the city council constituted a joint standing committee on legislative matters, whose duty it is to advocate or oppose measures at the State House as the city's interest demands. During the session of the General Court of 1879 some thirty matters directly affecting the city of Boston were presented, — eight of them petitions from the city government, — and the average each session for the past ten years has been about twenty-five. The legislation respecting Boston bridges will serve as an example of how much has been required. The Boston South Bridge, now known as the Dover-Street Bridge, was sold to the city by the original proprietors (among whom were William Tudor and Harrison Gray Otis), under an act of the General Court of 1831; and another act was passed in 1876, authorizing the widening of the bridge to sixty feet. The Federal-Street Bridge was established by a corporation (the Boston Free Bridge) created by an act of the General Court under which the city purchased the property. The Mount Washington-Avenue Bridge was acquired by the city under a similar act. The Broadway Bridge was built by the city under chapter 188 of the acts of 1866; the Congress-Street Bridge, under chapter 326 of acts of 1868, and nearly, if not quite, all the smaller bridges were bought from private proprietors under special laws. The Charles-River and Warren bridges were turned over to the cities of Boston and Charlestown by chapter 322 of act of 1868 and acts amendatory thereof. It was by commissioners appointed under chapter 302 of acts of 1870 that the expense of maintaining the West-Boston and Craigie's bridges was apportioned between Boston and Cambridge; and the legislature has been called upon more than once to decide disputes between Boston and Chelsea over the maintenance of the Chelsea bridge. In 1874 acts were passed granting authority for the building of a bridge by Boston and Cambridge, from a point on Beacon Street across the Charles River to Cambridge, and also a bridge to form part of an avenue from Brattle Square, Cambridge, to Market Street, Brighton; but neither has been constructed. The Cochituate water supply, the Boston registration and election laws, and hundreds of matters, ranging in moment from the purity of the ballot-box to the regulation of street-corner peanut-stands, have been subjects of legislation, the briefest history of which is too voluminous to attempt within these limits.

The great fire of Nov. 9 and 10, 1872, was the occasion of a special session of the General Court, which convened November 19. His Excellency Governor Washburn, in his address to the Legislature, said: —

"The loss of Boston is the loss of the Commonwealth. Our ties are such that this calamity affects even those of us who live in the remotest parts of the State. The municipal government of the city and a large number of its most eminent business men think that a few measures of immediate legislation are necessary. So far as I am informed, or can learn, the universal sentiment of those who reside or do business here is that they are abundantly able to meet the stress of the time from the resources now at their command, if they can have the assent of the State to such steps as require its sanction. It is thought advisable that assurance of a loan for a term of years at a moderate rate of interest should be given those who are unable to rebuild without assistance. . . . It is of the greatest importance that the waste places should be recovered as soon as possible with stores and warehouses of the most substantial kind, fully adapted to the requirements of a large and widely extended trade. As a means to this end the city will ask authority to issue its bonds, having not less than ten years to run, and bearing a rate of interest not exceeding five per centum in gold, or six per centum in currency."

The session lasted thirty days. A bill was passed authorizing the city to issue bonds to the amount of $20,000,000, with interest at five per cent gold and six per cent currency, to run fifteen years; the proceeds to be loaned to owners of sites of burned buildings. No bonds were issued, however, the act being declared unconstitutional by the Supreme Court. A general law, authorizing the formation of new insurance companies was enacted, with considerable other legislation concerning insurance. The act for the regulation and inspection of buildings in Boston was amended extensively, — thicker walls, with brick, iron, or stone supports, being required, and the law being made generally more stringent, and the penalties for its violation heavier. Acts were also passed requiring the board of aldermen to establish a grade of not less than twelve feet above mean low water, and prohibiting the construction of any cellar below that grade, and the use of any such cellar except for storage purposes under license from the board of aldermen; authorizing the city council to remove the Coliseum Building [1] if not taken down within a reasonable time; incorporating the Merchant's Exchange; to provide for the appointment by the governor and council of a commission of three civil engineers to investigate and report a plan for a thorough system of drainage for Boston and its vicinity within a radius of ten miles from the City Hall; [2] to provide for the issue of bonds in lieu of lost or destroyed bonds of the Commonwealth; to authorize the Old South Church proprietors to lease their meeting-house on Washington and Milk streets for use as a post-office.

But while the city has been constantly requiring legislation, it has sustained a very different relation to the Commonwealth in point of contributions to the support of the State government. In 1822 Boston paid $26,550.50 of the State tax of $75,000, or more than thirty-five per cent.

[1] This was a wooden structure near the crossing of the Boston and Albany, and Boston and Providence Railroads, erected for the musical festival of 1872.

[2] This act was conditional on the acceptance of the Boston City Council, and as no action was taken thereon the commission was never appointed.

At a rough calculation, the population of the State at that time was 550,000, and that of Boston about 50,000, or less than ten per cent of the whole. The United States census of 1830 found 610,408 inhabitants in Massachusetts, and 61,392 — a little more than ten per cent — in Boston, while the city paid that year $24,874.50, or over thirty-three per cent of the State tax of $75,000. Comparing the statistics on these points in later years, we find that in 1860, with a population of 177,840 in the State total of 1,231,066, — less than fifteen per cent, — the city paid $82,245 of the State tax of $249,995, which is over thirty-three per cent. In 1870 the population of the State was 1,457,351, and of the city 250,526, or seventeen per cent, while the city's share of the State tax was $933,775, or thirty-seven per cent of the total of $2,500,000. The present year its portion of the State tax was even larger, being $619,110 out of $1,500,000, or more than forty-one per cent. The returns of the United States census for 1880 give the State a population of 1,783,086, and the city 362,535, or a little less than twenty and a half per cent of the whole.

The representation of Boston in the General Court has been substantially, of course, in proportion to its population. The city's delegation in 1822 consisted of 6 senators in a Senate of 30, and 25 members in a House of Representatives numbering 236. The senators were John Phillips, John Willis, Jonathan Hunnewell, Warren Dutton, Lemuel Shaw, and Joseph Tilden; and the representatives were Josiah Quincy, Benjamin Russell, Thomas H. Perkins, William Prescott, William Tudor, Lynde Walter, James Savage, Benjamin West, Nathan Appleton, John Cotton, Gedney King, Enoch Silsby, Peter C. Brooks, Joseph Lovering, George W. Otis, Nathan Hale, Jonathan Phillips, Heman Lincoln, Edward Winchester, Francis C. Gray, Theodore Lyman, Jr., Henry Bass, Eliphalet Williams, William Shimmin, and Francis J. Oliver.

We find in the lists of the successors of these gentlemen the names of Samuel T. Armstrong, David Sears, Francis Jackson, David Henshaw, David Lee Child, Caleb Loring, Horace Mann, Theophilus Parsons, Robert C. Winthrop, George S. Hillard, Joseph T. Buckingham, George T. Curtis, John P. Healy, Charles Francis Adams, George T. Bigelow, John G. Palfrey, Samuel A. Eliot, Samuel G. Howe, and J. Lothrop Motley; and among the delegates from the city to the Constitutional Convention of 1853 were William Appleton, James M. Beebe, Sidney Bartlett, Jacob Bigelow, George W. Blagden, Rufus Choate, Francis B. Crowninshield, Samuel A. Eliot, Henry J. Gardner, Nathan Hale, George S. Hillard, Frederick W. Lincoln, Jr., J. Thomas Stevenson, John S. Tyler, and George B. Upton.

Between 1822 and 1857 Boston had 6 senators. The first apportionment under Article XXI. and XXII. amendments to the Constitution reduced the number to 5; but the second, in 1866, restored it to 6; and the third, in 1876, increased it to 8. One senator, however, has always been shared with Chelsea, Revere (or North Chelsea), and Winthrop.

Down to 1857 the numerical strength of the House of Representatives varied largely, and with it, though not in proportion, the delegation from Boston. In 1823 and 1824 the city had 25 members, and in 1825 24 in a House of 236; in 1826, 20 in 197; in 1827, 16 in 236; in 1828, 40 in 395; in 1829, 55 in 539; in 1830, 59 in 493; in 1831, 60 in 481; in 1832, 52 in 528; in 1833, 63 in 574; in 1834, 39 in 570; in 1835, 67 in 615; in 1836, 70 in 619; in 1837, 74 in 635; in 1838, 57 in 480; in 1839, 20 in 521; in 1840, 56 in 521; in 1841, 35 in 391. From 1842 to 1850, inclusive, the Boston delegation numbered 35, but the number of the whole House varied in these years as follows: 336, 352, 321, 271, 264, 255, 272, 263, 297. In 1851 and 1852 Boston had 44 representatives in Houses of 396 and 402 respectively; in 1853, 39 in 288; and from 1854 to 1857, inclusive, 44 in 310, 380, 329, and 327. Since then the House has consisted of 240 members, of which, under the first apportionment, Boston had 26; under the second, 33; and has under the third, and at present, 47.

The changes in the size of the House of Representatives between 1822 and 1857 were incident to the somewhat complicated system of apportionment, and the several apparent discrepancies in the proportion of the Boston delegation are but the natural results of the majority rule then in use. For instance, in 1838 the Boston City Council voted in convention, in accordance with the original charter, to fix the number of representatives to be elected that fall at 56; but at the election on the second Monday in November only 20 received a majority, and at the election to fill the 36 vacancies none at all, so that in 1839 the city was represented in the lower branch of the General Court by only 20 men.

A number of notable benevolent and educational institutions located in Boston, although not all exclusively of Boston, are beneficiaries of the Commonwealth. One is the Massachusetts General Hospital, which received with its charter in 1811 a conditional grant of the Province House estate, embracing a tract of land measuring 87 feet on Washington Street, and extending back 267 feet to Province Street. This estate was leased by the Hospital in 1817 for 99 years for what now seems the incredibly low rental of $33,000 for the entire term. In consideration of its grant the State has a representation of 4 members on the board of trustees. The Perkins Institution and Massachusetts Asylum for the Blind receives a regular annual grant of $30,000, and the School for Idiots and Feeble-Minded Youth $17,500; for which, however, the State receives a partial return in the education and care of some of its charges, and has also representatives on the supervisory boards. Special grants are made from year to year to other institutions, particularly the Massachusetts Charitable Eye and Ear Infirmary, which received $9,000 at the hands of the last legislature. The sites of the buildings of the Boston Society of Natural History and the Massachusetts Institute of Technology are the gift of the Commonwealth, so that the bread which Boston cast upon the waters in giving the Commonwealth the State-House site came back to it after many days; and by a

resolve of the legislature of 1880 the city of Boston was granted "perpetual right to hold, occupy, and control, free of rent or charge," a parcel of land at the corner of Boylston and Dartmouth streets, containing some 33,000 feet, for the erection of a new public library building.

The improvement by the Commonwealth of its Back Bay lands and the South Boston flats has of necessity required the co-operation of the city government in the extension of streets and the building of bridges and sewers. Under what is known as the tripartite agreement between the Commonwealth, the city, and the Boston Water-Power Company, the Back Bay territory was divided, some 108 acres going to the Commonwealth, and an equal quantity to the Water-Power Company, — the city to receive a small quantity of the land when filled, in satisfaction of certain claims. The Commonwealth and the Water-Power Company filled their respective portions to a certain grade, devoting a suitable proportion of the new land to streets and passage-ways, in which they laid sewers and set edgestones, while the city paved and maintains the streets and ways. The Commonwealth completed its filling at a cost of something over $1,600,000, and has disposed of all but about 3 acres. Nearly 145,000 feet were given for the sites of the buildings of the Natural History Society and the Institute of Technology, about 6,500 feet transferred to Trinity Church, 164,000 to the city, and over 2,000,000 devoted to streets and passage-ways. The sale of the remainder has netted the State, in round numbers, $3,000,000, furnishing a notable exception to the ordinary results of State management of business enterprises. In the improvement of the South Boston flats, yet incomplete, special relations exist between the State and the city, under the four-part agreement between the Commonwealth, the Boston and Albany Railroad, the Boston Wharf Company, and the city of Boston, the other parties doing certain filling, and the city agreeing to build two bridges across Fort Point Channel to connect the new land with the old. One of these, the Congress-Street bridge, is constructed, but the other awaits the filling of the land to which it is to furnish access. The magnificent area already here rescued from the ocean is guarded by a great sea-wall, girt with railroad tracks, and improved by the warehouses, elevators, and coal-sheds of the New York and New England Railroad. The process of filling is still going on, and will only stop when Castle Island is reached. Lying at deep water, and in the very heart of the city, these improvements will make a port for Massachusetts of unrivalled capacity and promise for the future.

There are judicial decisions touching the relations between the Commonwealth and cities which, though not particularly affecting Boston, are of sufficient general interest to deserve mention. One, in the case of Buttrick *v.* Lowell (1 Allen, 172), concerns the liability of a city for injurious acts of its police officers. Says the court: —

"Police officers can in no sense be regarded as agents or servants of the city. Their duties are of a public nature. Their appointment is devolved on cities and towns

by the legislature as a convenient mode of exercising a function of government; but this does not render them liable for their unlawful or negligent acts. The . . . powers and duties with which police officers and constables are entrusted are derived from the law, and not from the city or town under which they hold their appointment. . . . Nor does it make any difference that the acts complained of were done in an attempt to enforce an ordinance or by-law of the city. The authority to enact by-laws is delegated to the city by the sovereign power, and the exercise of the authority gives to such enactments the same force and effect as if they had been passed directly by the legislature. They are public laws of a local and limited operation, designed to secure good order and to provide for the welfare and comfort of the inhabitants. In their enforcement, therefore, police officers act in their public capacity, and not as the agents or servants of the city."

Boston has several military organizations bearing peculiar relations to the Commonwealth. First is the Ancient and Honorable Artillery Company, dating back two hundred and forty-three years, in whose ranks have marched governors, judges of the supreme court, senators, and generals, and whose officers are to this day invested with the badges of their authority by the Governor in person. Next in order of seniority is the First Corps of Cadets, the Governor's body-guard, whose first tour of duty was to escort William Shirley, Governor of the Province of Massachusetts Bay, on a visit to the Colony of Rhode Island in 1741. It was at first known as the Independent Company of Cadets, and as such was commanded by John Hancock in 1774. Hancock was summarily dismissed from the command by Governor Gage in a letter (still preserved in the archives of the corps), on the receipt of which the company promptly gave up the Governor's standard, and informed him that the dismissal of their first officer was equivalent to disbandment. The company thereupon disbanded, but did not become extinct, reviving in 1776 under the name of the "Independent Company," and reorganized under its present charter in 1786.

Another of Boston's famous corps is the National Lancers, whose gay uniforms and fluttering pennons have for so many years given a touch of color and picturesqueness to the Governor's Commencement Day procession from Boston to Cambridge.

There are other Boston military companies having a long and honorable record, — the "Tigers," the school of Boston soldiers since 1798, and the "Fusiliers," who had the honor of being Governor Hancock's body-guard on general election day in 1792; but the "Ancients," the "Cadets," and the "Lancers" alone bear at present any exceptional relationship to the Commonwealth. Massachusetts will never forget, however, the days when every Boston military organization represented her; and there is hardly a field of battle in the South whose story does not tell how gallantly they bore her flag, and how proudly they sustained her martial fame.

It is significant that the Commonwealth has placed as her fittest representatives in the national gallery at Washington the statues of two men of Boston. As in the days of Winthrop and Sam Adams, so Boston stands

now, a representative of Massachusetts. It represents in its myriad manufactories, mills, and workshops, and in the well-tilled and fertile fields which lie about it, the varied industries of the State. It represents in its marts, in its busy stores and massive warehouses, the enterprise and solidity of her trades. It represents in its fifty millions of bank capital, and in the character of its financiers, her pecuniary wealth and stability. It represents in its fifty millions of savings-bank deposits the thrift and economy of her people. In its hospitals, asylums, and charitable institutions it represents the benevolent and public spirit for which Massachusetts is pre-eminently distinguished. It represents in its public schools the best results of that system of popular education which is one of the Commonwealth's chief glories, and in its higher institutions of learning her best scholarship and broadest culture. In its pulpits it represents the devoutness and the zeal of the olden time, with the toleration and liberality of the later. In whatever constitutes the prosperity of Massachusetts, Boston stands her worthy representative; and there is hardly a school-house or a fireside in the Commonwealth that has not contributed to the population, the character, the enterprise, and the good name of this its capital city.



[NOTE. — The Editor is indebted to Captain A. A. Folsom for a list of the commanders of the Ancient and Honorable Artillery Company; and of the one hundred and seventy-one commanders from 1638 to 1880, forty-seven have been residents of Boston and Suffolk County, as follows: —

Capt. William Alexander, 1806; Capt. Bozoun Allen, 1676; Maj.-Gen. Humphrey Atherton, 1650, 1658; Lieut. Edwin C. Bailey, 1862, 1871; Col. John Ballentine, 1703, 1710; Capt. Samuel Barrett, 1771; Capt. Jonas S. Bass, 1800; Maj. William Bell, 1771, 1786; Col. George Tyler Bigelow, 1846; Maj. George Blanchard, 1805; Capt. Edmund Bowman, 1807; Maj. Martin Brimmer, 1826; Maj. Francis Brinley, 1848, 1852, 1858; Capt. John Carnes, 1649; Lieut. Col. John Carnes, 1748; Maj. George O. Carpenter, 1868; Col. Samuel Checkley, 1700; Capt. Joshua Cheever, 1741; Col. Thomas E. Chickering, 1857; Capt. Thomas Clark, 1796; Maj. Thomas Clarke, 1653, 1665; Capt. Thomas Clarke, Jr., 1673; Maj. Moses G. Cobb, 1855; Brig.-Gen. Robert Cowdin, 1863; Maj. Andrew Cunningham, 1793; Maj. James Cunningham, 1768, Capt. Nathaniel Cunningham, 1731; Brig.-Gen. Amasa Davis, 1795; Brig.-Gen. Thomas Davis, 1835; Capt. William Davis, 1664, 1672; Col. Thomas Dawes, Jr., 1766, 1773; Brig. Gen. H. A. S. Dearborn, 1816; Maj. Thomas Dean, 1811; Maj. Louis Dennis, 1838; Col. William Downe, 1732, 1741; Lieut.-Gov. William Dummer, 1719; Capt. Thomas Edwards, 1753; Col. Thomas Fitch, 1708, 1720, 1728; Maj. Dexter H. Follett, 1871; Capt. Albert A. Folsom, 1870; Capt. James A. Fox, 1851; Capt. Theophilus Frary, 1682; Lieut.-Col. Jonas H. French, 1811; Capt. Lemuel Gardner, 1803; Col. Robert Gardner, 1731; Capt. Martin Gay, 1732; Col. Daniel T. Gibbens, 1851; Maj.-Gen. Edward Gibbons, 1639, 1641, 1644, 1651; Maj. Alex. Hamilton Gibbs, 1823; Capt. John Greenough, 1725; Maj. Newman Greenough, 1758; Capt. Ralph Hart, 1774; Capt. Thomas

Hawkins, 1644; Maj.-Gen. William Heath, 1770: Lieut.-Col. Daniel Henchman, 1738, 1746; Maj. Joseph L. Henshaw, 1865; Col. Sir Charles Hobby, 1702, 1713; Capt. Melzar Holmes, 1808; Capt. William Homes, 1764; Capt. William Howe, 1814; Capt. William Hudson, 1661; Capt. John Hull, 1671, 1678; Col. Thomas Hunting, 1827; Capt. Edward Hutchinson, 1657; Col. Edward Hutchinson, 1717, 1724, 1730; Col. Elisha Hutchinson, 1676, 1684, 1690, 1697; Col. Thomas Hutchinson, 1704, 1718; Col. Joseph Jackson, 1752; Capt. Robert Jenkins, 3d, 1790; Capt. Isaac Johnson, 1667; Capt. Robert Keayne, 1638, 1647; Capt. Samuel Keeling, 1716; Capt Thomas Lake, 1662, 1674; Maj.-Gen. Sir John Leverett, 1652, 1663, 1670; Col. Benjamin Loring, 1818; Capt. Caleb Lyman, 1739; Brig.-Gen. Theodore Lyman, Jr., 1822; Col. Charles A. Macomber, 1839; Col. Thomas Marshall, 1763, 1767; Gen. Aug. P. Martin, 1878; Capt. Edward Martyn, 1715; Capt. Hugh McDaniel, 1750; Col. Daniel Messenger, 1804, 1810; Capt. Francis Norton, 1655; Capt. James Oliver, 1656, 1666; Capt. Peter Oliver, 1669; Lieut.-Col. Peter Osgood, 1809; Col. Nicholas Paige, 1695; Maj. John C. Park, 1853; Maj. James Phillips, 1802; Col. John Phillips, 1685; Col. John Phillips, 1747, 1759; Capt. Parker H. Pierce, 1830; Col. Edward Gordon Prescott, 1833; Lieut.-Col. Josiah Quincy, Jr., 1829; Brig.-Gen. John H. Reed, 1866; Capt. John Roulstone, 1815; Maj. Benjamin Russell, 1801, 1812; Lieut.-Col. George P. Sanger, 1854; Capt. Ephraim Savage, 1683; Lieut.-Col. Habijah Savage, 1711, 1721, 1727: Maj. Thomas Savage, 1651, 1659, 1668, 1675, 1680; Col. Thomas Savage, Jr., 1705; Capt. Thomas Savage, 1757; Maj.-Gen. Robert Sedgwick, 1640, 1643, 1648; Maj. Samuel Sewall, 1701: Maj. Samuel Sewall, 2d, 1734; Col. Samuel Shrimpton, 1694: Col. Amasa G. Smith, 1837; Capt. Thomas Smith, 1722: Capt. John L. Stevenson, 1877; Col. Ebenezer W. Stone, 1841; Capt. Ebenezer Storer, 1749; Lieut.-Col. Israel Stoughton, 1642: Brig.-Gen. William H Sumner, 1821; Lieut.-Col. John Symmes, 1755, 1761; Maj. Charles W. Stevens, 1880; Col. William Tailor, 1712; Col. William Tailor, 1760; Lieut.-Col. Newell A. Thompson, 1843; Capt. Onesiphorus Tilestone, 1762; Capt. Samuel Todd, 1797; Col. Penn Townsend, 1681, 1691, 1698, 1709, 1723; Brig.-Gen. John S. Tyler, 1832, 1844, 1847, 1860; Lieut.-Gen. John Walley, 1679, 1699, 1707; Capt Josiah Waters, 1769; Col. Josiah Waters, Jr., 1791; Capt. Samuel Watts, 1742: Capt John Welch, 1756; Brig.-Gen. Arnold Welles, 1811; Capt. George Welles, 1820; Col. Jacob Wendell, 1735, 1745; Col. John Wendell, 1740; Col. Jonathan Whitney, 1813; Col. Marshall P. Wilder, 1856; Capt. Jonathan William, Jr., 1751; Capt. John Wing, 1693: Col. Edward Winslow, 1714, 1729; Brig.-Gen. John Winslow, 1792, 1798; Lieut.-Col. Adam Winthrop, 1706: Brig.-Gen. Grenville T. Winthrop, 1834; Brig.-Gen. John T. Winthrop, 1825: Maj.-Gen. Wait Winthrop, 1692; Capt. Richard Woodde, 1677; Col. Isaac Hull Wright, 1850; Col. Edward Wyman, 1872; Col. Charles W. Wilder, 1879. — Ed.]

CHAPTER IV.

BOSTON SOLDIERY IN WAR AND PEACE.

BY GENERAL FRANCIS W. PALFREY.

DURING the eighteenth century Boston could hardly be called a growing town. There were fluctuations in the number of its people; but it is not far out of the way to set that number at twenty thousand as an average from 1700 to 1800.[1] By the census of 1810 its population was given as 33,250. As had been the case almost from the earliest days of the settlement, so in the beginning of the nineteenth century, its citizens were largely dependent upon commerce for their prosperity. The state of things existing upon the continent of Europe was very prejudicial to that commerce. In common with the other residents of the seaboard, the citizens of Boston complained especially of wrongs to commerce from the British orders in council, and the retaliating French decrees. Great Britain refused to admit that free ships made free goods, and that arms and military stores alone were contraband of war, and that ship-timber and naval stores were excluded from that description. The British practice of impressing our seamen, and of capturing American vessels bound to or returning from ports where her commerce was not favored, was also a standing grievance. From such causes the state of feeling in Massachusetts at the beginning of the year 1812 was far from placid. In a general way it may be said that the Federalists were opposed to war; but though strong in New England they were weak in Congress. They had, however, always favored a navy; but the other great political party, the Democrats or Republicans, opposed this, till the naval victories of 1812 caused them to change their minds. It was

[1] [There are a few notes in Whitman's *Ancient and Honorable Artillery Company*, p. 324, on the general apathy in militia matters immediately following upon the peace, and on the impulse to militia organization which took place in Boston at the time of the Shays Rebellion. As a result of this movement the Ancient and Honorable Artillery Company renewed their meetings, which had been omitted since 1775; the Corps of Cadets was reorganized, with Samuel Bradford for commander; the Republican Volunteers (infantry), and a light infantry company, Harrison Gray Otis commander; the Massachusetts Fusileers, Captain William Turner, — all began their history, not all to continue long. A cavalry company was raised, with Rufus G. Amory as captain; followed by the Boston Dragoons, Captain Henry Purkitt, who had been of Pulaski's Cavalry Corps in the Revolution. Some years later (1803) when Governor Strong brigaded the Suffolk Militia, prominent among them were the Washington Light Infantry, Captain Loring; the Boston Light Infantry, Captain Henry Sargent; and the Winslow Blues, Captain Messenger. — ED.]

understood that the President of the United States, Mr. Madison, was anxious to avoid war, but that he was also anxious to secure a renomination; and it was believed that he might think the support of the more fiery spirits, like Clay and Calhoun, necessary for his ends, and that he might determine to purchase their support by consenting to war. The war feeling was naturally weak on our unprotected seaboard, and stronger in the interior. Even in Massachusetts, however, public opinion was much divided. In January, 1812, a motion was lost in our Senate by a single vote for a call on the Government for information about impressment; about the employment of ministerial printers to aid in destroying our own, and in establishing over us a British government; about plots for incendiary fires, and threats of assassination. In the same month, however, the Senate appears to have concurred with the House in ordering that the Secretary of the Commonwealth should give any certificate which might be necessary to procure the release of American seamen, free of any charge.

On Feb. 24, 1812, at a meeting of the selectmen of the town of Boston, there was presented an application from a number of gentlemen styling themselves a committee from the Republican Convention of the County of Suffolk, requesting the use of Faneuil Hall on the first Thursday of March following. Thereupon it was voted —

"That the selectmen are not acquainted with the existence of any such public body, and as the hall was built and enlarged for the use of the town, they cannot consent that it should be occupied for any purposes which in their opinion would not meet the approbation of the town."

On the 4th of April, Congress passed an act laying an embargo for ninety days from and after the passage of the act on all ships and vessels in the ports and places within the limits or jurisdiction of the United States, cleared or not cleared, bound to any foreign port or place; with a proviso permitting the departure of foreign vessels, either in ballast, or with the goods, etc., on board the same, when notified of the act.

On the 10th of the same month, Congress passed an act authorizing the President of the United States to require of the executive of the several States and Territories to take effectual measures to organize, arm, and equip according to law, and hold in readiness to march at a moment's warning, their respective proportions of one hundred thousand militia. Early in June the Massachusetts House of Representatives, upon the motion of Mr. Putnam, of Salem, —

"*Resolved*, as the opinion of this House, that an offensive war against Great Britain, under the present circumstances of this country, would be in the highest degree impolitic, unnecessary, and ominous; and that the great body of the people of this Commonwealth are decidedly opposed to this measure, which they do not believe to be demanded by the honor or interest of the nation; and that a committee be appointed to prepare a respectful petition to Congress to be presented, praying them to avert a calamity so greatly to be deprecated, and by the removal of commercial restrictions to

restore so far as depends on them the benefits of trade and navigation, which are indispensable to the prosperity and comfort of the people of this Commonwealth."

This resolution was passed by a vote of four hundred and two to two hundred and seventy-eight, and the address reported in accordance therewith was adopted by a vote of four hundred and six to two hundred and forty; but a protest, signed by one hundred and eighty-six members of the House, was presented and placed on file. The Senate concurred, and thereupon the Legislature of Massachusetts sent to Congress a memorial against the war.[1] The counsels of those who favored war prevailed, however, and on the 18th of June the President of the United States signed the bill declaring war; and on the 23d of the same month the Secretary of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts delivered to the Senate of that State a message from the Governor, communicating a letter from the Honorable James Lloyd, a senator from Massachusetts, covering a declaration of war against Great Britain. Thereupon the House appointed a committee to consider the question of passing a resolve requesting the Governor to appoint a Fast "in consequence of the great and distressing calamity of the late unexpected Declaration of War." Two days after, the House, one hundred and forty-nine to three, ordered accordingly, "On account of the great and distressing calamity which God in his holy Providence has permitted to be brought on the people of these United States."

Thus the United States of America were at war with Great Britain, and Boston was one of the most important seaport towns of the United States. Besides the forces of the General Government, Massachusetts had her own militia to look to; and, so far as names were concerned, this was an important force. The whole male population, substantially, between the ages of eighteen and forty, was enrolled in the militia. The militia was arranged into seventeen divisions,[2] and a major-general for each was chosen from time to time by the Senate and House of Representatives, and publicly qualified with much form. A brigade under the law of Congress was composed of four regiments, each of two battalions of five companies, and each company of sixty-four privates. The efficiency of much of this force was little more than nominal. The defences of the harbor were then as follows:[3] —

On Castle Island stood Fort Independence, a name given, in place of the earlier designation retained from the Provincial times, on the occasion of the visit of President John Adams, in August, 1799. The first stone of the new Fort Independence was laid May 7, 1801, and the whole superstructure was raised from an original design. The work was a barbette fortification, and its dimensions were not materially different from those of the present Fort In-

[1] [See Mr. Lodge's chapter in this volume for a statement of the feeling in Boston respecting the war. — Ed.]

[2] Four of which were mostly in what is now the State of Maine. See the *Report* of the Committee of the Council, upon which action was taken in revoking the organization of all divisions after the thirteenth, prior to Aug. 6, 1812.

[3] For much of my information upon this point I am indebted to the courtesy of General H. G. Wright, Chief of Engineers, U. S. A.

dependence. On June 23, 1802, the national colors were first displayed on the new fort, and the workmen were dismissed in January, 1803.[1]

On the summit of Governor's Island stood Fort Warren, an enclosed star fort, built of stone, brick, and sod, with a brick barrack for seventy men, and a cellar under it, 65 by 20, for provisions, etc. It had also a brick officers' quarters, a brick magazine, and a brick guard-house.

On the south side of Governor's Island was Fort Warren Battery, built of brick, stone, and sod, with a brick guard-house for fifteen men, and a brick magazine. This battery was to mount fifteen cannon, and to have a block-house in its rear.

On the point formed by the Charles and Mystic Rivers was Charlestown Point Battery, built of sod, with a stone foundation. In it ten pieces of heavy cannon might be mounted.[2]

In pursuance of the Act of Congress providing for calling out the militia, a requisition was made upon the Governor of Massachusetts for the quota of that State. Thereupon a Committee of the House of Representatives reported an address which contained these words: "If your sons must be torn from you by conscriptions, consign them to the care of God; but let there be no volunteers except for defensive war." The address of the Senate to the people of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts was a shade more national in its tone. "Let our young men who compose the militia," it said, "be ready to march at a moment's warning to any part of our shores in defence of our coast."

The call for the militia led Governor Strong of Massachusetts to ask the Justices of the Supreme Court for their opinion upon certain questions to which the call gave rise. His request was dated Aug. 1, 1812, and the judges thereupon gave their opinion that commanders-in-chief of the militia of the several States had a right to determine whether any of the exigencies contemplated by the Constitution of the United States existed, so as to require them to place the militia or any part of it in the service of the United States, at the request of the President, to be commanded by him pursuant to acts of Congress. They also advised him that when any such exigencies existed, authorizing the employment of the militia of the United States, the militia thus employed could not lawfully be commanded by any officers but those of the militia, except by the President of the United States.[3]

[1] The five bastions of the new work were named Winthrop, Shirley, Hancock, Adams, and Dearborn. Under Governor Winthrop the first fort on the island had been built; Governor Shirley had repaired and added to Castle William, and made the post the strongest fort in British America; under Governor Hancock new works were thrown up; President Adams gave the name of Fort Independence to the fort, and under General Dearborn, Secretary of War, the new Fort Independence was built.

[2] It should be stated that this account of the works on Charlestown Point and Governor's Island is taken from a report made in 1808, by Major J. G. Swift, of the Engineers; and it is assumed that these works remained unchanged in the war of 1812, or at least undiminished. [See also the report of Jonathan Williams and Alexander Macomb, abstracted in Lossing's *Pictorial Fieldbook of the War of* 1812, p. 235. — Ed.]

[3] As early as the 8th of July of this year, at a meeting of the selectmen of the town of Boston, the chairman was desired to confer with General

On the 30th of August in this year Hull arrived in Boston, and gladdened the people by the news of the capture of the "Guerrière," and received their welcome. On the 16th of September following, fifteen thousand cartridges were ordered by the selectmen, and on the 23d of October the Senate passed a resolve for the purchase of gunpowder and other military stores, and for building a suitable storehouse for the same.

On Jan. 20, 1813, on the application of the officers of a company called the Rangers, newly raised in Boston, an armory was assigned for their use; but the record does not indicate that the company was raised for the reason that the country was at war.[1]

In February following, the Senate and House concurred in resolves authorizing the Governor to adopt defensive measures to protect the towns and shores of the Commonwealth and the town and harbor of Boston; but the Senate at the same time refused to pass a resolve of the House calling on towns to return the number of seamen impressed.

The General Court had appropriated $100,000 for the purpose of placing the ports and harbors of this Commonwealth in a better state of security; but the House at this time pronounced the sum inadequate, asserted the duty of the General Government in that regard, under Article IV. section 4 of the Constitution of the United States, declared that the General Government had neglected that duty, and directed that representation thereof be made to it, with a request for an appropriation and for garrisons.

In March of this year there were services at King's Chapel to commemorate the victories of the Russians over Napoleon, who aimed, it was said, at the empire of the world. It is to be remembered that the headquarters of the "Peace Party" were at Boston. The spring elections in New England showed decided gains for that party. The town of Boston or its selectmen appear to have taken steps in April, 1813, on the application of General Brooks, for a conference between the Governor and the selectmen with a view to local defence; but the record does not show that anything came of it. On May 12 it was provided that the New-England Guards — a Boston company — should have an armory.

At this time affairs in Boston were much depressed by reason of the existing state of war. At the close of May the "Shannon" and the "Tenedos" were watching our harbor; and on June 1 the "Shannon" captured the American ship "Chesapeake."[2] In these months of May and June there seems to

Welles, and to consult him upon the proper measures to prevent the practice of drumming in the streets after sunset; and on the 11th of August following, on the report of a committee appointed at a town-meeting held shortly before in favor of patrols, lights in windows, etc., the selectmen voted accordingly; and, three weeks after, they made somewhat elaborate provisions for a watch, to be composed of a captain and one hundred men, to be on duty till daylight.

[1] [A year or two before, a company of Hussars had been raised in Boston, with Josiah Quincy for captain; and later being formed into a squadron with the Dragoons, Quincy became their major. (E. Quincy's *Life of Josiah Quincy*, p. 346.) Whitman records that during the war a company of riflemen was raised in the town, Samuel P. P. Fay commanding it, and that it was disbanded after the peace. There were three militia companies in Charlestown, — the Charlestown Artillery, the Warren Phalanx, and the Light Infantry. — Ed.]

[2] [See Admiral Preble's chapter, following this. — Ed.]

have been much alarm as well as depression in Boston and in Massachusetts. The commissioners appointed by the Governor in the preceding month of March to carry into effect the resolutions of the General Court for the protection of the town of Boston, its harbor and vicinity, and the towns and ports of the Commonwealth, made their report. The House took action thereon, and appointed a committee to consider means for the restoration of peace, and of restoring the Commonwealth to the blessings of a free and unrestricted commerce, now blighted by the "unhappy war," and adopted a remonstrance to Congress; while the Senate (June 3) used strong language about the General Government, and concurred with the House in appointing commissioners in regard to the defenceless condition of the sea-coast, and for considering what measures it is expedient for this Legislature to adopt in relation to "the unhappy war in which we are engaged," speaking of it as "unjust, unnecessary, and iniquitous," and as "waged without justifiable cause, and prosecuted in a manner which indicates that conquest and ambition are its real motives."

On March 30 in the following year (1814), and before election, the *Columbian Centinel* published an address to the men of Massachusetts, which said: "Your present old captain won't let a Press-gang drag a man of you into Wilkinson's land service. If you want to list, and die of the camp-ail, he won't hinder you, for he wants only true hearts of oak aboard (*i. e.*, aboard the good STRONG ship 'Massachusetts'), that will defend the ship till she conquers or goes down."[1]

On April 19, 1814, the town was alarmed by the report of a number of ships of war off the coast; and in consequence, and at the suggestion of the field officers of the Boston militia, the selectmen met and addressed a letter to the adjutant-general. Two months after, on June 18, the selectmen met commissioners appointed by the Governor and Brigadier-General Welles. The question of victualling and pay was raised. It was decided that the selectmen must subsist the men employed, and that the question of pay should be left to the next General Court. The selectmen promised General Welles that they would attend to any communication from him in reference to provisions and camp equipage.

By June 27 a general sense of alarm prevailed. Commissioners were appointed on the part of the town to confer with Commodore Bainbridge about sinking hulks.[2] They reported two days after that hulks were to be

[1] It does not appear that life in Boston was altogether anxious and dull in the spring of 1814, for we read that Mr. and Miss Holman were then appearing at the theatre in a round of characters, playing *Cymbeline*, *Wives as they Were*, *Alexis*, *The Provoked Husband*, *As You Like It*, *Jane Shore*, etc.; that the *Edinburgh Encyclopædia* and the *Bride of Abydos* were for sale in the book-stores, and that Mr. Turner, the dancing-master, was inviting the masters and misses of the period to "trip it lightly while you may" at his academy in Bumstead Place, and promising them instruction even in the plain minuet. A Mr. Atwood was already selling oysters in Water Street; and shell commodes, lion-head ring commodes, fluted clock-balls, bed-caps, and other desirable ware were to be had of W. H. Anderson. [Nor were the demands of war so importunate but that great schemes of tide-water mills could be projected, — as appears by Dearborn's map, February, 1814, given in another chapter, — and even new methods of printing be devised, as that map shows. — ED.]

[2] [See Admiral Preble's chapter. — ED.]

got ready, and that artillery, etc., were ready. It was arranged that ten companies of artillery should come from the neighboring towns at first alarm to co-operate with detachments now made from the Boston militia.

On July 6 Colonel Osgood, commanding detachment of militia on Boston Common, applied for kettles, pans, axes, spades, pint pots, straw, wood, etc. Many of the militia on duty asked for additional compensation, but the board of selectmen were of one mind that it was not expedient to call a town-meeting to consider that question at that time.

On August 3 provision was made for a temporary gun-house on the Common. On the 24th of the same month, on the petition of a number of inhabitants of the town for a town-meeting for defence, the selectmen voted that it was inexpedient; that they had the fullest confidence in the Governor and his commissioners, and that it was not well to excite alarm by calling a meeting, or to seem to distrust the Governor. The petitioners persisted, and thereupon the selectmen voted to print their reasons for declining. On the 30th Boston was threatened; and on September 3 there was a town-meeting, called on the petition of Winslow Lewis and more than ten freeholders, to provide "means of-defence in the present exposed and dangerous situation of this town." The Hon. Thomas Dawes was chosen moderator. The resolutions adopted rehearsed the manifestness of the fact that in the progress of this unhappy war —

"The destruction of the public ships and naval arsenals in the various ports in the United States is a principal object of the enemy; and therefore this town, notwithstanding its uniform disapprobation of the measures which led to this calamity, and its endeavors to avert it, may be exposed to danger from an enterprise against the ships of war which are now lying in our port, without any adequate means of protection and defence furnished by the General Government."

And presently proceeded: —

"And whereas we believe that the brave and disciplined militia of this and the neighboring counties, which are ready at the shortest notice to repair to any point of attack, will present to an invading foe a superiority in number to any force which is yet known to be upon our coast, — yet as in times of great and imminent danger, extraordinary exertion and alacrity become the duty of the citizen, and it may be acceptable to His Excellency the Governor to receive the assurance that the citizens of Boston in the times which try men's souls are, as they have been, ready to aid by their manual labor and pecuniary contributions, and by all the ways and means in their power, in promoting and making effectual any measure of defence which may be devised by the proper authority, . . . "

then expressed confidence in the Executive, deplored the evils and calamities of war in the production of which they were in no wise instrumental, declared that they — the citizens of Boston — were not dismayed, promised cheerful and cordial co-operation, and that, when in the opinion of the Governor the occasion might require, they would "make prompt

and effective arrangements for the employment of all classes of the citizens in the construction of fortifications or other means of defence, and for obtaining from patriotic individuals voluntary loans and contributions of money to be applied to these objects."

This meeting was followed by volunteer digging. Fort Strong[1] was built at East Boston, on the southerly end of Noddle's Island; a battery was placed on Dorchester Heights, and other defences were prepared at Roxbury and Cambridge.[2]

On September 16, at a meeting of the selectmen, a proposal was made to cut the bridges connecting the peninsula on which the town stood with the main land; and two engine companies were assigned to each bridge, — that is to say, to the Charles River Bridge, the Canal Bridge, West Boston Bridge, and the South Bridge.

On the 19th an address was adopted, calling for patriotic donations; it spoke of exertions "necessary to assist the Government of the State, upon whose protecting arm, under Divine Providence, we wholly depend." The total of the contributions thus obtained seems to have been $11,149.

In a letter from H. H. Dearborn to Thomas H. Perkins, dated Fort Independence, Sept. 25, 1814, the writer says: "On this and Governor's Island there are a sufficient number of men for manning all the works which are now erected or begun." He then speaks of his intention to begin forthwith works planned for the protection of "the defenceless positions on Governor's Island," and says that he will be very glad to receive assistance from the citizens in labor, and recommends that each man should bring a spade, shovel, pick-axe, or wheelbarrow, and that he would be glad to see two or three hundred men on the following Tuesday. He then describes certain works begun and nearly completed by him on both Castle Island and Governor's Island, and says that he has received from the laboratory at Albany fifteen hundred pikes, and sent them to the two garrisons, by

[1] I am indebted to Mr. Isaac H. Cary, Jr., of Brooklyn, New York, for the information that he has in his possession a little blank-book, about the size of an ordinary bank-deposit book, which was found among the papers of the late Isaac Harris, who died at the "North End" of Boston, aged over ninety years, in the year 1868; and he has kindly furnished me with a copy of it, which reads as follows: "Boston, Sept. 8, 1814. The subscribers, Mechanics of the Town of Boston, to evince our readiness to co-operate by manual labor in measures for the Defence of the Town and Naval Arsenal, do hereby tender our services to His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief, to be directed in such manner as he shall consider at this eventful crisis most conducive to the Public Good." Then follow the signatures of about one hundred and fifty names of North-End mechanics. Mr. Cary thinks the paper was without doubt drawn up by Paul Revere, he being the first signer; opposite each name is a statement of the time for which each man agrees to serve. He says that these men were sent by Governor Strong to work on the fortifications on Noddle's Island; and that his father, now eighty years old, and a nephew of Isaac Harris, remembers going there to see his father, who was there at work. Mr. Cary also informs me that the boys from the public and private schools who were able to assist were allowed to be absent from school during school hours. [See also Mr. Lodge's chapter in this volume. — Ed.]

[2] It may be remarked that at this time smuggling seems to have been prevalent at Boston. At about this time the selectmen voted, "during the present state of alarm, to attend daily."

the order of Major-General Dearborn, for the defence of the curtains and bastions of the fort and the parapets of the batteries; that all the forts and batteries under his command will, by the next day or day following, have an ample supply of ordnance stores of every kind. He recommends that the Boston and Charlestown Sea-Fencibles be stationed in the batteries to be erected on the east and north sides of Governor's Island, every other week alternately, with their cannon and equipments. He states that two mortars will be placed on Governor's Island, and that furnaces will be ready sufficient to supply with hot shot all the guns which can be brought to bear on ships at the same moment in all the works on the island; that he has written to Commodore Bainbridge to express to him the opinion that if the hulks are immediately sunk, and it is found that the channel is sufficiently obstructed, it will be advisable to have the United States ships "Independence" and "Constitution" moored above them, to co-operate with the garrison. He next informs his correspondent of the signals which have been established to announce the approach of the enemy, and that a guard-boat is sent from Fort Independence every night to a point near the mouth of the harbor, with rockets as signals. He next recommends that the troops which are to reinforce Fort Independence and Fort Warren, in the event of an alarm, be stationed on Dorchester Point, in the old work, with boats in sufficient number for transportation, and a large proportion of field artillery with case shot. He ends his letter by stating that, in the event of an alarm, Major-General Dearborn will assume the command of the two forts, and take the immediate command of one, while the other will be assigned to the writer.

On the 26th the selectmen ordered that a notification as to work on the fortifications be printed. On October 13 another public-defence address was adopted, in regard to the completion of Fort Strong. In the same month a conscription was proposed; and because the Massachusetts militia was not placed under the orders of General Dearborn, the Secretary of State refused to pay the expense of defending Massachusetts from the common enemy. The Legislature of Massachusetts reported in favor of a conference of States.

By November 3 several forts and works about Boston had been erected, and then the danger or the alarm seems to have passed away; and we find no more matter of interest till we read that the "joyful news of peace" arrived, early in the following year, 1815.

The war with Mexico was no more popular in Massachusetts and in Boston than the war of 1812 had been, though the reasons for its unpopularity were entirely different. The war with Mexico was unpopular for the reason that it was regarded as a war in the interest of the Slave-power; and although in the then division of the community into the Whig and Democratic parties, opposition to the institution of Slavery, or to its extension, was not a direct issue, yet a third party, — the party which was afterward

to triumph under the name of Republican, and to annihilate in its rise and progress not only the substance but even the name of the Whig party, — was beginning to make its presence felt, and the citizens of Massachusetts were not inclined to promote a war which was not only distant, but waged for purposes which very many of them did not approve. It was not till the month of May, in the year 1846, that the fact that we were at war with Mexico came directly home to us. On the 19th of that month the Secretary of War enclosed to the Governor of Massachusetts a copy of a recent Act of Congress, providing for the prosecution of the existing war between the United States and the Republic of Mexico, and asking him "to cause to be enrolled, and held in readiness for muster into the service of the United States," one regiment of infantry.

By this time Boston had been for more than twenty years a city, and her population had reached a total of upwards of 115,000 souls.

On May 26 Governor Briggs, of Massachusetts, issued a proclamation which contained the following words: "Whatever may be the difference of opinion as to the origin or necessity of a war, the constitutional authorities of the country have declared that war with a foreign country actually exists;" and he called upon the citizen soldiers of Massachusetts to enroll themselves, etc. In the following month of July there was correspondence between the Adjutant-General of Massachusetts and the Secretary of War, in consequence of which further proceedings in relation to the above-mentioned requisition were suspended.

On November 16, in the same year, the Secretary of War renewed the requisition; and by January of the following year a regiment was so far raised that Caleb Cushing, of Newburyport, was elected Colonel, Isaac H. Wright, of Roxbury, Lieut.-Colonel, and Edward W. Abbott, of Andover, Major. Among the captains who were, or might be considered, Boston men were Webster,[1] Felt, and Paul, of Boston, and Bunker of Charlestown. By February 4 following, the field and staff and non-commissioned staff and eight companies had been mustered, and were ready to receive orders for embarkation, which in due time came; and to Mexico the regiment went. It is understood that the Massachusetts regiment never went into action, in whole or in part. General Orders from the office of the Adjutant-General of the army, dated June 8, 1848, provided that it should be sent direct to Boston; and on the 20th and 21st of the same month the barques "Victory" and "Winthrop" took four hundred and fifty of its members, apparently the whole regiment, from Vera Cruz, bound for New Orleans, on their homeward journey.

To come to the War of Secession. By the census of 1860 the population of Boston was declared to be about 178,000. This total would have been made considerably larger had it included the population of the near neighboring towns and cities, which were almost one with Boston

[1] Captain Edward Webster was a son of Daniel Webster.

commercially and socially, as well as topographically, but were not then, any of them, included within her city limits.[1]

It is seldom if ever easy to look back for twenty years and tell what were then the feelings and state of mind of one's self and one's contemporaries. It is the less easy to do so if the four years which followed the period to which the attention is directed were years of exceptional trial, excitement, and suffering. Of what may have been the general state of mind in Boston in the winter of 1860-61 we do not undertake to speak, but to those who were then in the morning of their days we think that life seemed much as usual, but perhaps a trifle pleasanter, by reason of a slight impression of a sense of romantic possibilities near at hand. The unrest of the South gave a piquancy to existence, such as the officers may have felt at the Duchess of Richmond's ball, the night before Waterloo. Those of us who were less than fifty-five or sixty years old had absolutely no personal knowledge of war, and uniforms and martial music are always attractive; and to those who have never followed the drum, and know nothing of fatigue and wounds and hunger and thirst and strain on the nerves, and the suffering that cold and heat and dust and sleeplessness and the other minor trials of war may bring to the soldier who is neither wounded nor ill, soldiering seems a dashing, fascinating life.

The relation of the city of Boston to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts is imperfectly and incompletely indicated by a statement of the population of the one and of the other.[2] Boston was the capital of the State, and that was much; yet that it had always been. But it was much more than that. It was not only the principal city of the State and of New England, but the first without a rival to dispute its pre-eminence. The termini of the great railroad and steamship lines were there. The centre of thought, the mass of wealth, the most active trade and commerce, the leading newspapers were all there; while the improved facilities of the Post Office, supplemented by the electric telegraph, brought it into closer relations with the most distant corner of the Commonwealth than existed between it and Worcester at the time of the war of 1812. The very closeness of the ties which united Boston to the towns of the Commonwealth, whether near or far, — the very prominence of its position as a part of Massachusetts, — make it hard to tell with accuracy what it did towards carrying on the war. Much that was done there was done by other than Boston men. Much that was done there by Boston men was done in the furtherance of the good work in directions which were not distinctly, and in some cases little or not at all, Bostonian. But as in war the last dollar often wins; and as many men are procured, and all are supplied and equipped and supported by money; and as no hostile gun was fired during the war within some

[1] The population of the county of Suffolk, which included, besides the city of Boston, the city of Chelsea and the towns of North Chelsea and Winthrop, was 192,678. The valuation of the county in 1860 was $320,000,000. It is said that Suffolk county furnished for the civil war 28,469 men; but this total includes large numbers of men who served in the navy, and of what were known as "paper credits."

[2] [See Governor Long's chapter. — Ed.]

hundreds of miles of Boston; and as neither the whole nor the half of what Boston did in and for the War of Secession can here be told, — there seems to be no better course to follow than to endeavor to tell what money the city raised, and what troops she placed in the field.

As in the war of 1812, so in the period preceding the outbreak of the War of Secession, public opinion was divided in Boston. The Democratic party was strong there; and the Democratic party had been too long and too firmly united to the dominant party at the South to feel any sympathy with a movement which took its rise in hostility to the most important and most cherished institution of the South. The Democratic party did not stand alone. The Whig party, though almost dead, was dying hard; and the Webster Whigs, the Silver Grays, the Bell and Everett men, the Conservatives generally, were for peace at almost any price. As late as February 5, such men as Judge Curtis, Mr. Stevenson, Mr. Hillard, and Mr. Saltonstall were speaking in Faneuil Hall in favor of the Crittenden compromise resolutions; but in Cambridge, six days later, Mr. Palfrey and Mr. Dana were declaring the South to be in revolution, or in mutiny, and proclaiming themselves to be uncompromisingly loyal to the Union.

By the morning of April 16, 1861, when Sumter had been fired upon, companies of militia began to arrive in Boston, in obedience to the order of the Governor, based upon a telegraphic call for troops from Washington; fifes and drums began to be heard, the streets were thronged with people, flags were displayed in every direction, and the red, white, and blue rosette was seen on many a breast. Individuals offered pecuniary aid to soldiers' families. The Hon. William Gray sent $10,000 to the State House. The banks of Boston offered to lend the State $3,600,000, in advance of legislative action. Many of the leading physicians of the city volunteered to give their professional services to the families of the soldiers. The Boston bar voted to take charge of the cases of those of their brethren who went to the war, and that liberal provision be made for their families.[1] By the 19th $30,000 had been raised in Boston to aid in the formation of a regiment of infantry, of which more will be said in its place.

The attack on Fort Sumter had a wonderful effect upon public opinion in Boston, as well as elsewhere. On April 16 the *Boston Post*, the leading Democratic newspaper of New England, published an appeal to the people, in which it called upon all to choose whether they would help to preserve "our noble Republican Government," or descend into the pit of social anarchy; and warned them to "adjourn all other issues until this self-preserving issue is settled." On the 21st, in the Music Hall, Wendell Phillips gave the war a welcome "hearty and hot," and said: "I rejoice, for the first time in my Antislavery life, I stand under the stars and stripes, and welcome the tread of Massachusetts men." On the 27th, Mr. Everett, in

[1] For much of the statistical information contained in the following pages I am indebted to the *History of Massachusetts in the Civil War*, in two volumes (one general, the other on the towns), by Mr. Schouler, for some years Adjutant-General of the Commonwealth.

a speech made in Chester Square, declared that the Government of the country must be sustained. He said: "Upon an issue in which the life of the country is involved, we rally as one man to its defence. All former differences of opinion are swept away. We forget that we ever have been partisans: we remember only that we are Americans, and that our country is in peril." He was followed by Mr. Hallett, one of the foremost of the Democratic politicians of Boston and of New England, whose loyalty to the Union, like that of Mr. Everett, from this day to the day of his death never grew cold.

On April 15, 1861, Faneuil Hall, and all other buildings under the control of the city which were suitable for the accommodation of troops, were placed at the disposal of the Governor. On the 19th $100,000 were appropriated "for the good care and comfort of the soldiers who may be in Boston." By April 27, 1861, the city had arranged to subsist the troops detailed to garrison the forts in the harbor. The first detachment of these troops, the Fourth Battalion of Infantry, composed almost wholly of young Boston men, occupied Fort Independence on April 26.

In the ten months beginning with June, 1861, the Treasurer of the city was authorized to borrow $100,000 for the payment of State aid to soldiers' families, and this total gradually grew to upwards of $1,000,000; but the whole amount was repaid to the city by the Commonwealth. In July, 1862, $300,000 were appropriated to pay bounties to such volunteers as might enlist to fill the quota of the city, and this sum was swelled by successive appropriations, — the last of which seems to have been in July, 1864, — to a total of $1,380,000. The total amount of money expended by the city, exclusive of State aid, is set down at a little over $2,500,000.

Of the hospitalities of the city to soldiers going to and returning from the front; of the city relief committee; of the discharged soldiers' home; of the "committee of one hundred," which raised and expended the Massachusetts soldiers' fund; of the gifts of ice, provisions, and clothing; of Mr. Evans's offer of the Evans House as a place of deposit for contributions for the soldiers, and of the use made of it by Mrs. Otis, who established there the "Bank of Faith;" of the New England Women's auxiliary association, a branch of the United States sanitary commission, with headquarters in Boston; of the Boston soldiers' fund, — of all these mere mention must suffice; and to mention these leaves almost countless other patriotic acts and sacrifices unnoticed.

It is said that Boston furnished twenty-six thousand one hundred and seventy-five men for the war. As about one sixth of the men furnished by Massachusetts for the service of the United States during the war were men in the navy, it is fair to assume that the total above given as the quota of Boston is to be diminished by more than one sixth to approximate the number of men furnished by her for the land service.

This showing, apparently so creditable, is unfortunately far from being an accurate presentation of the truth. Many, very many, men took up

arms from patriotic motives, and were volunteers in fact as well as in name; but there were thousands and thousands of men who were perfectly able to go, and would have made excellent soldiers, but who preferred to stay at home. The ranks came to be filled by men who had received bounties — sometimes very large — to induce them to enlist. The fear of the draft was great, and money was poured out freely to procure so-called volunteers, and to purchase substitutes. The trade in men became brisk and lucrative, and the character of the regiments so reinforced and so formed depreciated in proportion. While the drag-net, baited with dollars, was thrown out at home, desertion became common at the front. The phrase "bounty-jumper" became as familiar as a household word. Men enlisted, received the bounty, deserted, enlisted again, deserted, and so on; while plenty of women were found ready to marry successively the men whose pockets were heavy with bounty-money, and who were pretty sure not to reappear in the scenes in which they had been mustered and received their bonus. If these men had been all Americans, or persons resident in America, it would have been bad enough; but foreigners were imported in considerable numbers for the express purpose of being placed in the ranks. In one case some hundreds of freshly imported Germans arrived at the front one evening, were mustered into a Massachusetts regiment of the very first class, and the next morning were thrust into one of the bloodiest battles of the war, without being so much as able to understand the words of command. Enough was done and suffered by Massachusetts men in the war to afford just ground for pride; but when we exult over the uprising of a great people, we of Massachusetts and of Boston must not forget that there were shadows to the picture. Had the men of Boston in July, 1863, been as full of patriotic fervor and the spirit of self-sacrifice as were the early volunteers, public opinion would have been such that even the short-lived riot which then disturbed the peace of the city could not have taken place.

It is hard to say what regiments of infantry and cavalry and batteries of artillery Boston sent to the field, because it is probable that there was not a single organization all the members of which came from its people. It is coming pretty near the truth to say that the 1st, 2d, 9th, 11th, 12th, 13th, 19th, 20th, 24th, 28th, 32d, 33d, 35th, and 56th regiments of infantry, the 3d regiment of heavy artillery, the 1st, 2d, 3d, 6th, 10th, 11th, 12th, and 13th batteries, and the 1st, 2d, 3d, and 4th regiments of cavalry, were from Boston, — that is to say, the majority, or at least a large part, of their officers and men were Boston men. The 54th and 55th regiments of colored infantry, and the 5th regiment of colored cavalry, were raised largely under Boston influence. To these may be added the 44th and 45th regiments of infantry, which were especially Boston regiments; but they enlisted only for nine months, and were not much exposed, and had less than one per cent of their numbers killed in action. Of the three-years' regiments the 1st was a militia regiment, which volunteered for the war. The 9th and

28th were Irish regiments. The 2d, 20th, and 24th were raised under more or less exceptional circumstances, especially the 2d.

In the formation of all these three regiments, and to a considerable extent in that of the 1st and 2d cavalry, the officers were mainly selected by other judges than the men of their commands or the officials at the State House. In the formation of the other regiments and batteries, company officers were usually elected by their men, and the field and staff appointed at the State House. A comparison of the returns of the loss by death of some fourteen of these regiments shows a remarkable evenness of experience.

GENERAL THOMAS G. STEVENSON.[1]

In eight of them it was about ten per cent. One, which was thrust into the bloody battles of the Wilderness almost as soon as it left the camp where it was formed, lost about sixteen per cent by death. The loss of the other three was from twelve to fifteen per cent. In the percentage of killed in action, omitting those who died from wounds or disease, there is a discrepancy as remarkable, — the percentage ranging from less than three to

[1] [General Stevenson was born in Boston in 1836, — a son of the Hon. J. Thomas Stevenson. He was a captain of the Massachusetts militia when the war broke out. He became colonel of the 24th regiment, and led it in the North Carolina campaign. He became brigadier-general Dec. 27, 1862, and was in the attack on Fort Wagner. He was in command of the first division, ninth corps, when he fell near Spottsylvania, May 10, 1864. — Ed.]

over seven per cent. The actual loss in action of the 20th regiment was much the largest, — one hundred and ninety-two against one hundred and sixty-one in the regiment which came next to it; but the 20th not only had a large number of men on its rolls than any other regiment of infantry from Massachusetts included in the above list, but had the fortune to be



GENERAL WILLIAM F. BARTLETT.[1]

almost always actively engaged. General Orders from the headquarters of the army of the Potomac, dated March 1, 1865, specifying the names of the actions in which the regiments and batteries of the army of the Potomac had borne a meritorious part, and which they were ordered to have in-

[1] [General Bartlett was born at Haverhill, June 6, 1840, — the son of a Boston merchant. He was appointed captain in the 20th Massachusetts regiment, July 10, 1861, while yet a student at Harvard. He became colonel of the 49th regiment, Nov. 10, 1862, and distinguished himself at Port Hudson. The next year he was made colonel of the 57th Massachusetts regiment, and was in the Battles of the Wilderness. He became brigadier-general of volunteers, June 21, 1864, and commanded a division of the ninth corps; and was captured before Petersburg, July 30, 1864. He was exchanged in September, and at the close of the war was brevetted major-general. He lost a leg, and was otherwise wounded, during his service. He died Dec. 17, 1876. — Ed.]

scribed on their colors or guidons, assigned to that regiment a number greater than that assigned to any other infantry regiment in that army. The loss of this regiment from desertion was also small, — about seven per cent, — while the average loss was about twelve per cent. The table on the next page may be found interesting; but in consulting it, it must be remembered that the 32d, 33d, and 35th regiments of infantry did not go to the



COLONEL PAUL J. REVERE.[1]

front till after the first of July, 1862, when the fighting of the Peninsula campaign, so called, was ended; that the 54th and 55th regiments of infantry were not organized till 1863, nor the 56th till 1864; that the 1st and 2d cavalry were three battalion regiments, each battalion containing four companies, and that they thus had a considerably larger number of officers than the infantry regiments; that the 3d cavalry was, from its organization

[1] [Colonel Revere was born in Boston, Nov. 10, 1832; graduated at Harvard College in 1852; became major of the 20th Massachusetts Volunteers in July, 1861; advanced to a lieutenant-colonelcy on the staff in September, 1862, and to the colonelcy of the 20th in April, 1863. He was mortally wounded, July 2, 1863, at Gettysburg, and died July 5. He is buried at Mount Auburn. A sketch of his life, by General W. R. Lee, is in *Harvard Memorial Biographies*, i. 204. — ED.]

in the autumn of 1862, an infantry regiment, till midsummer of 1863, when it was "converted into a regiment of cavalry" by General Banks, and had three companies added to it. The formation of the 2d cavalry also dates from the autumn of 1862. The fortune of war made the experiences of commands so different, that only general results can be arrived at by a comparison of the returns. Thus the 19th Massachusetts, though brigaded with the 20th, was absent from several engagements in which the 20th took part in the first year of the war, and engaged at least once when the 20th was not: —

ORGANIZATION.	TOTAL.	Killed in Action.	Died of Wounds, Disease, etc.	Deserted.
First Regiment Infantry	1981	93	88	155
Second Regiment Infantry	2767	116	156	276
Ninth Regiment Infantry	1922	153	105	241
Eleventh Regiment Infantry	2423	85	147	328
Twelfth Regiment Infantry	1758	128	126	191
Thirteenth Regiment Infantry	1584	71	75	171
Nineteenth Regiment Infantry	2469	104	160	174
Twentieth Regiment Infantry	3230	192	192	229
Twenty-fourth Regiment Infantry	2116	63	147	112
Twenty-eighth Regiment Infantry	2504	161	203	288
Thirty-second Regiment Infantry	2969	79	198	163
Thirty-third Regiment Infantry	1412	69	107	79
Thirty-fifth Regiment Infantry	1665	91	134	40
Fifty-fourth Regiment Infantry (black)	1574	54	154	40
Fifty-fifth Regiment Infantry (black)	1295	52	132	27
Fifty-sixth Regiment Infantry	1319	69	134	129
Third Heavy Artillery	2358	1	40	383
First Battery	319	5	15	7
Second Battery	415	1	25	13
Third Battery	318	6	13	9
Sixth Battery	451	5	50	57
Tenth Battery	274	4	19	4
Eleventh Battery	199	2	11	1
Twelfth Battery	300	.....	25	75
Thirteenth Battery	355	.....	26	99
First Cavalry	2767	49	167	161
Second Cavalry	2841	62	147	622
Third Cavalry	2653	60	203	372
Fourth Cavalry	2018	21	123	262
Fifth Cavalry (black)	1516	.....	117	124

The regiments of colored infantry lost heavily, — the 54th about thirteen per cent, and the 55th over fourteen per cent; but the killed in action in each of these regiments was to their deaths from other causes as one to two and one half, or three; while in the white regiments it was in four cases as great or greater, and in three exceeded three-quarters. It should be

COLONEL ROBERT GOULD SHAW.[1]

said further to the credit of these colored regiments, that the percentage of desertion in neither reached three per cent. The colored cavalry regiment had not a man killed, but lost about eight per cent by death and the same by desertion. The losses in the cavalry regiments proper, — that is, excluding the converted 41st infantry, — ranged from seven to eight per cent. Desertion in the 1st cavalry was small, — only six per cent. In the 4th it was about thirteen per cent, while in the 2d[2] it rose to the enormous

[1] [Colonel Shaw was born in Boston, Oct. 10, 1837, the son of Francis G. Shaw, and grandson of Robert G. Shaw, the well known merchant of Boston. He served a brief term in Washington, on the outbreak of the war, as a private in the New York Seventh Militia regiment; and, May 28, was made a second lieutenant in the Second Massachusetts Volunteers. He became first lieutenant, July 8, 1861; and captain, Aug. 10, 1862; and then, when the 54th Massachusetts Regiment was formed, — the first of the colored regiments recruited under State authority, — he became its colonel, April 17, 1863; and died at their head, July 18, 1863, in an attack on Fort Wagner, South Carolina, and was buried with his men, where they fell. See *Harvard Memorial Biographies*, ii. 172. — ED.]

[2] I have it from good authority that the desertion from the second cavalry was almost wholly from the seven companies enlisted in Massachusetts, and that from the five companies which came from California there was scarcely any. It occurred almost entirely before the recruits were sent forward from the State, and on the way to the field. It is understood to have been owing to the fact that the better class of

number of six hundred and twenty-two in two thousand eight hundred and forty-one, or nearly twenty-two per cent. The losses in the batteries were heavy, but only in two instances seemed to have reached ten per cent, while the desertion from them was generally creditably small.



LIEUT.-COLONEL WILDER DWIGHT.[1]

The general reputation of the Massachusetts troops was extremely good, and there were none among them better than some of the organizations which have been named as coming from Boston. If the Governor and people of Massachusetts had been as eager to keep the early regiments full, as they were to furnish their quota in such a way as to make sure that no man should go to the war who did not wish to, it is probable that by midsummer of 1863 the Massachusetts contingent would have been as fine a

real volunteers was exhausted, that high bounties had begun, and that anything in the shape of a man which the medical officer would pass, was eagerly taken, regardless of quality, to fill the quota. Men under sentence are said to have been released from jail on condition of enlisting. As soon as the bounty was paid, the first opportunity to desert was seized. Some of these men were so mutinous one day in Boston that Colonel Lowell shot one of them dead.

[1] [This cut follows a likeness prefixed to the *Life and Letters of Wilder Dwight*, by his mother, Boston, 1868. A briefer narrative by the same is given in the *Harv. Mem. Biog.*, i. 252, under the class of 1853. He was wounded at Antietam, Sept. 17, 1862, and died two days later. He is buried in Forest Hills Cemetery. His brothers, William, Jr., and Howard, were respectively brigadier-general and captain. The latter was killed by guerillas in Louisiana, May 4, 1863. — Ed.]

body of troops as the world has often seen. The men were intelligent, apt, reasonable, healthy, patient, and brave, ready to submit to discipline as soon as they perceived its meaning and value; ready and able to march all day and all night when the occasion called for it; ready to die in their

MAJOR HENRY L. ABBOTT.[1]

places so long as their orders bade them to stand and the evil hour lasted. It was a shame to pour in among such soldiers the scum and refuse of humanity which the pernicious bounty system turned in their direction.[2]

[1] [Major Abbott, the son of Hon. Josiah G. Abbott, was born in Lowell, Jan. 21, 1842; graduated at Harvard in 1860. On the outbreak of the war he did a brief garrison duty at Fort Independence, and was commissioned second lieutenant in the 20th Massachusetts Regiment on July 10, 1861; first lieutenant, Nov. 8, 1861; a captain, Aug. 29, 1862; and major, May 1, 1863. He was killed at the Battle of the Wilderness, May, 6, 1864, and his commissions as brevet colonel and brevet brigadier-general date from that day. He was in most of the considerable battles in which the army of the Potomac was engaged, and for a long time commanded his regiment. His record is admirably recounted by the writer of this chapter in the *Harvard Memorial Biographies*, ii. 91. — ED.]

[2] [It will be remembered that while Burgoyne's army was in Cambridge, a practice obtained of recruiting the Massachusetts quota of the Continental army by enlisting deserters from this convention camp, and that it met the earnest protest of Washington. Sparks's *Washington*, v. 287, 297. — ED.]

SOLDIERS' MONUMENT ON THE COMMON.[1]

Brilliant as were the records of many of these bodies of men, there was probably not one among them that did not suffer in reputation and fall be-

[1] [This monument, executed by Martin Milmore, sculptor, was dedicated Sept. 17, 1877. It bears the following inscription, which was furnished by President Eliot of Harvard University:

low its own ideal, because of the contaminating flood which was let loose upon them. To such pollution was due the death of a gallant captain of a distinguished Massachusetts regiment, murdered by the camp-fire on the ground of his own company, and almost certainly by one of his own bad men, who was never brought to justice.

The system of bounties would have been bad enough if it had stood alone, but it was coupled with another evil, — the constant formation of new organizations. It was natural that men should flock into them, for it meant for all a period of easy life so long as the formation was completing, while enlistment in a regiment or battery in the field meant a speedy plunge into the grim realities of war. It meant for the best men a vastly greater chance of promotion. Corporals and sergeants had all to be made, and a man who showed himself an efficient and serviceable sergeant in the home camp had a good chance of soon finding himself a lieutenant. But so it was; and by reason of this course of action at home our best regiments saw their numbers dwindling, and only feebly swelled from time to time by men generally of low quality, while up to the very end of the war they saw fine detachments of recruits arriving to enter the Western regiments, which came from States where a wiser policy prevailed.

It would not be easy, and it would be invidious, to attempt to range the Boston regiments on a scale of merit; and the little that may be said must be said with diffidence. The 1st and 2d Massachusetts cavalry regiments and some of the Boston batteries were probably as good as any cavalry of volunteer artillery in the service; and some of the Boston infantry regiments had certainly no superiors in our armies, whether regular or volunteer. The Second regiment had a peculiar origin and a grand history. It was raised by authority from the Secretary of War, and the appointment of officers was left to its projectors and organizers, — two graduates of West Point, who became its Colonel and Lieut.-Colonel, and Wilder Dwight, a young Boston lawyer of great promise, who was the life of the enterprise, and who became Major of the regiment. A very large sum of money was raised to facilitate the project. The very best young men of Boston and its vicinity sought and obtained commissions as line officers, while the

"To the men of Boston, who died for their country on land and sea in the war which kept the Union whole, destroyed Slavery, and maintained the Constitution, the grateful city has built this monument, that their example may speak to coming generations." The city printed an *Army and Navy Monument Memorial* the same year, including photographs of the monument, its sculptured figures and reliefs, and the chief address of the occasion, delivered by General Charles Devens. The monument is over seventy feet high, and the figure on the top eleven feet. It cost $75,000. There are other monuments erected in the same spirit in other parts of the city, — one at Charlestown, likewise the work of Milmore, costing $20,000, and dedicated in 1872, with an address (printed) by Richard Frothingham; one at Dorchester, after a design by B. F. Dwight, thirty-one feet high, dedicated Sept. 17, 1867; one in Forest Hills Cemetery in Roxbury, designed by Milmore, representing an infantry soldier, erected in 1867; one in Jamaica Plain, thirty-four feet high, designed by W. W. Lummis, and dedicated Sept. 14, 1871, with an address by the Rev. James Freeman Clarke; one in Evergreen Cemetery, Brighton, thirty feet high, dedicated July 26, 1866, with an address by the Rev. Frederic A. Whitney. It cost about $5,000. King's *Handbook of Boston*, pp. 83-90. — Ed.]

men were the cream of the volunteers of Massachusetts, the choice offering of the first fresh enthusiasm of the time. The discipline of the regiment was admirable. The fortune of war kept it long out of action, but in covering Banks's retreat in 1862 it so bore itself as to win the highest commendation from Southern officers. There is probably nowhere in print such a tribute to the gallantry of Northern soldiers from the Southern side as is to be found in Allan's *Valley Campaign*, where he tells how Andrews and the Second Massachusetts contested Jackson's advance near Winchester. So long as this regiment was in the army of the Potomac it bore itself gallantly, and distinguished itself particularly at Cedar Mountain and at Gettysburg. Afterward it was sent to the West, and was one of the few Eastern regiments which made the march to the sea with Sherman; and at Averysboro', at the very end of Sherman's campaign, and at the end of the war, it moved gallantly out with scant numbers to face the enemy; and one of its captains, leading forward his company, which the policy of Massachusetts had left of about the size of a corporal's guard, was shot dead just before the bugles sang truce.

The vigor and splendid gallantry of the Fifty-fourth Massachusetts infantry at the assault on Fort Wagner proved to the world that the African race would make excellent soldiers when properly trained and led. Their Colonel and Lieut.-Colonel were Shaw and Hallowell, who came to these positions, the one from the Second and the other from the Twentieth Massachusetts infantry. The Second and the Twentieth, though they seldom served together, were always mutually attached, and emulous of each other. They had many points of similarity. They were officered from very much the same social class.

Of the early history of the Twentieth it is not well for the writer of this paper to speak;[1] but from the end of 1862 to the end of the war the discipline maintained in it was exact, like that of the Second, and both regiments showed many shining examples of brilliant bravery and tenacity.

At Fredericksburg the Twentieth crossed the river in boats under fire,

[1] [The Editor may venture to add that General Palfrey was commissioned Lieut.-Colonel of this regiment at its organization in 1861; that he served with it continuously on the Potomac (commanding it during the captivity of Colonel Lee, from Oct. 21, 1861, to May 1, 1862), before Yorktown, and in the whole Peninsular campaign; that the regiment bore a distinguished part in the battles of Fair Oaks, Savage's Station, and Glendale, in which last engagement it was directly commanded by its Lieut.-Colonel, Colonel Lee commanding the brigade; that Colonel Palfrey commanded the regiment during the stay at Harrison's Landing and the withdrawal from the Peninsula, and until the battle of the Antietam, where the regiment was in the hottest of the fight, and lost heavily in common with the rest of Sedgwick's Division, and where Colonel Palfrey was severely wounded. It is not too much to say, that the reputation of the Twentieth was established during this period, — a reputation for discipline, gallantry, and steadiness, which was accorded to it by common consent, and which it maintained throughout the war; and that in the formation of this reputation Colonel Palfrey ably seconded the efforts and example of the gallant officer in command of the regiment, Colonel William Raymond Lee, in whose stead he acted for over eight months of its first year of service. General Palfrey's wound, unfortunately for himself and for his command, proved so severe as to unfit him for further active service. — Ed.]

and cleared the main street leading from the river, losing thirty-five out of the sixty men of its leading company, and having ninety-seven officers and men killed and wounded in the space of about fifty yards. It made the forced march of over thirty miles to Gettysburg without having a single man straggle from the colors. It was part of the mass of men who hurried to the spot where Pickett's division had made a partial lodgment in our line on Cemetery Ridge; and when the fierce attack had failed, it was reduced to the complement of a company, — one hundred and two men, of whom three were officers. At Bristoe Station it took guns from A. P. Hill's corps. On a day of disaster before Petersburg, when the enemy had turned our left, and was rolling up our line and capturing regiment after regiment, it changed front under fire, stopped the enemy's advance, and saved the troops in the line to its right. It gave Putnam, Lowell, two Reveres, Abbott, Patten, Babo, Wesselhoeft, Ropes, Paine, and eight more officers, to the list of those who were killed in action or died of wounds received there. As the Second shared in the great review as a part of Sherman's army, so the Twentieth shared in it as a part of the army of the Potomac, with a record of some thirty battles.

Among the officers of the Boston regiments were Welles of the 1st, afterward killed while in command of the 35th Massachusetts, and Major Chandler, also of the 1st; Savage, Mudge, Dwight, Abbott, Cary, Robeson, Goodwin, Grafton, and Perkins of the 2d, who all were killed or died of wounds received in action; Gordon of the 2d, who became a Brigadier, and was brevetted Major-General; Colonel Cass of the 9th, Colonel Webster of the 12th, and Lieut.-Colonel Merriam of the 16th, all killed in action; Colonel Hinks of the 19th, who became a Brigadier and Brevet Major-General; Bartlett and Macy of the 20th, one of whom lost a leg and one a hand, and both of whom were brevetted Major-General; Colonel Stevenson of the 24th, who was killed near Spottsylvania as a Brigadier-General commanding a division; Colonel Prescott of the 32d, who died of wounds received in action; Underwood of the 2d and 33d, afterward a Brigadier and Brevet Major-General; Colonel Wilde of the 35th, promoted Brigadier-General, and Sidney Willard of the same regiment, killed at Fredericksburg; Colonel Griswold of the 56th, killed in the Wilderness; and the very gallant and accomplished Colonel Lowell of the 2d cavalry, killed in the Valley campaign of 1864.

No Boston man was made a Major-General in the War of Secession; but the same is true of the men of Massachusetts, if we except General Banks and General Butler, who did not rise by regular promotion to that grade, but reached it at a bound on the stroke of a pen at Washington. Several Boston men became Brigadiers, — as Cowdin, Gordon, Andrews, Hayes, Bartlett, Stevenson, Paine, Wilde, — and most of these received the brevet of Major-General. The brevet of Brigadier-General was given to many Colonels and Lieut.-Colonels who went from Boston. Disabling wounds or death fell to the lot of so many of the Boston officers,

by reason of the fact that the best young men of the period went into the infantry instead of seeking positions on the staff, or even in the artillery or the cavalry, that few of them lived or preserved their health long enough to rise high. It should never be forgotten that Boston gave freely of her very best to the infantry, which does the fighting and bears the losses. This means more than the general public is aware of. The 2d and 20th infantry, with their 5,997 men, had 308 killed in action; the 1st and 2d cavalry, with 5,608 men, had 111 killed. The 2d and 20th infantry lost thirty-four officers, of whom twenty were killed in action; the 1st and 2d cavalry, with their more numerous officers, lost seventeen, of whom nine were killed in action. The eight batteries which we have credited to Boston, with 2,631 men, had twenty-three killed in action, of whom three were officers. Combine and analyze the figures as one will, and it will appear to have been many times more dangerous to be in the Massachusetts infantry regiments than in the Massachusetts artillery, and nearly or quite twice as dangerous as to be in the Massachusetts cavalry. The staff, of course, was comparatively safe. Wherever our Boston regiments went, it was common for the officers to find their friends from New York serving not in the line, but upon the staff; and this was almost equally true as to Philadelphia.

The Boston men who filled the ranks of the regiments and batteries which have been named as coming more from Boston than from elsewhere, saw service almost everywhere. In all the campaigns and battles of the army of the Potomac, from the first Bull Run to Lee's surrender, many of them were present. At Fair Oaks and Glendale and Malvern Hill, at the second Bull Run, at the Antietam, at Fredericksburg and Chancellorsville, at Gettysburg and Bristoe Station, in the Wilderness and at Spottsylvania, at Cold Harbor and before Petersburg, at Deep Bottom and Ream's Station and the Boydton Road, at Roanoke Island and Newbern and Olustee, from Lookout Mountain to Atlanta, from Atlanta to Savannah, and from Savannah through the Carolinas, — from the first clash of arms in the summer of 1861, to the firing of the last shot in the spring of 1865, the white flag with the arms of Massachusetts was to be seen; and wherever it waved, brave men from Boston fought and fell.

The militia of Massachusetts has been, ever since the end of the War of Secession, a favorite object for our legislators to try their plastic hands upon. In 1864 Colonel Henry Lee, who had served long and efficiently on the personal staff of the Governor of Massachusetts, printed a very elaborate pamphlet of one hundred and thirty pages,[1] in which he laid down what he considered to be the true basis for a satisfactory militia system; urging especially reduction in numbers, uniformity of organization, the furnishing by the General Government of arms and equipments, the framing of a code of tactics expressly for the militia, the creation of a general mili-

[1] Entitled, *The Militia of the United States: What it has been; What it should be.*

tia staff, and rudimentary instruction in tactics in every public school. Large use of his labors was made by the commission which had much to do with framing the existing militia law of Massachusetts.

The pressure of the war being removed, our legislators went busily to work on the militia. In thirteen years they established three systems, and filled more than one hundred and fifty pages of our statute book with provisions in regard to the militia. The law now in force was passed in 1878. It is the shortest and much the best of the three. It provides that, "to resist invasion, quell insurrection, and in the suppression of riots to aid civil officers in the execution of the laws of the Commonwealth, or in time of public danger, the volunteer militia shall first be ordered into service." The law provides for sixty companies of infantry, three companies of cavalry, three four-gun batteries, and two corps of cadets. The infantry companies are to consist of from forty-one to fifty-nine men, with a captain and two lieutenants; the cavalry companies of from fifty-six to seventy-seven men, and a captain and two lieutenants; the batteries of from fifty-seven to eighty-three men, with a captain and three lieutenants. These troops are assigned to two brigades, each of which is to contain six infantry regiments, each of two or three battalions, and each battalion to contain four companies. The number of enlisted men in the companies of cadets is not limited, and each may have a lieut.-colonel, major, staff, and not to exceed four captains, four first, and four second lieutenants. Original enlistment is for three years; afterward it may be for one, two, or three years, at the option of the individual. Nine years of continuous service exempts from jury duty for life.

The existing system is thought to have worked well. The present condition of the militia is good, and probably as good as it is likely to be. The men have enthusiasm, a good amount of pride, and of soldierly spirit. Relatively they are better than their officers; but the officers are improving under the established practice of requiring them to pass an examination before receiving promotion. The weakest part of the system is the want of control of the colonels, who, once commissioned, are not easy to remove, and of whom several are at the present time not up to the mark. A strong and independent adjutant-general is the only remedy for this; but it is hardly possible for an adjutant-general, whose tenure of office is what it is in Massachusetts, to reach this standard, though the present adjutant-general is well spoken of. It is desirable that the individual holding so important a position should have had experience of real service, or West-Point training, and important that he should not be given to red-tapism, and two rigid construction of the letter of the law and regulations. Our code of regulations is excellent. It is modelled largely upon the English code, and is likely to be followed, with such changes as their laws may make necessary, by New York and by Maine. Properly construed and applied, it will be most useful; but too rigid construction is undesirable, as it tends to discourage men who would make excellent officers from taking or holding com-

missions. The unnecessary multiplication of the clerical business of the officer is especially to be avoided. The ideal adjutant-general will take broad and not narrow views. What is best in our militia is due to the prevailing soldierly enthusiasm. There is next to no power anywhere to *force* militia-men in time of peace to be good soldiers; and this defect is one which appears to be irremovable.

Our infantry is well equipped and fairly well drilled, and is much the best of our militia, though one of our batteries is good. The cavalry is as good as militia cavalry anywhere; but from the nature of the case militia cavalry is practically valueless as cavalry. Both horses and men must be trained, and trained together, to make good cavalry. The medical department of our militia is the ablest branch of the service, and is positively excellent. The first corps of cadets has been for many years under the command of a rarely accomplished and indefatigable officer, and under his influence it has made remarkable progress in the direction of military efficiency, and is now the example which the rest of the militia strives to equal.

Whether our militia will ever improve, or even continue to be as good as it is now, will depend very much upon the degree to which the politicians will let it alone. The men are capable and willing, and to very many of the officers a commission means work, and not play or show; but there must not be frequent changes in high places, or appointments or changes for other than sound moral and military reasons, if the Massachusetts militia is to be an institution of value.

F. W. Palfrey

CHAPTER V.

THE NAVY, AND THE CHARLESTOWN NAVY YARD.

BY REAR-ADMIRAL GEO. HENRY PREBLE, U.S.N.

THE naval history of Boston for the last one hundred years is not replete with exciting incidents. It exhibits in the main the growth and development of a great naval establishment for the building and repair of the ships of the United States. Many ships of war which have since become historic have been launched, but no great naval battle has been fought within its harbor.[1]

In 1789 the ship "Massachusetts" was built at Germantown, — a large, double-headed promontory, jutting into Boston Bay, in the town of Quincy. The "Massachusetts" was the largest merchant vessel which at that time had been built on this continent, her keel being one hundred and sixteen feet in length. She was a frigate-built ship, of nearly one thousand tons burden, pierced for thirty-six guns, of a remarkably fine model, and constructed in the most thorough manner. People came from all parts of the country to witness her launch, and the day was one of jubilee and rejoicing.[2]

[1] The correspondence of the commandants of the Navy Yard with the Department and Bureau at Washington, since 1816, and the log-books or journals of the Yard at Charlestown index sufficiently the principal naval events of the one hundred years; and these, supplemented by the newspapers of the day, furnish ample material for a much more extended naval history of Boston than this chapter can afford. Under an order from the Navy Department, dated May 22, 1874, the writer of this chapter was detailed to special duty to write the histories of the Boston and Portsmouth Navy Yards. Having accomplished the duty, he reported his results to the Department; but the histories of those Yards remain on file, in MS., in the Bureau of Yards and Docks, at the Navy Department. [Admiral Preble has touched some parts of this subject already in his *Notes on Ship-Building in Massachusetts*, published in the *N. E. Hist. and Geneal. Reg.*; nor is his elaborate *History of the Flag of the United States*, 2d ed., 1880, without interest in this connection. — Ed.]

[2] Quincy, in his *Memoir of Major Samuel Shaw*, says: "On this interesting occasion the hills around Germantown and the boats which covered the harbor and river were filled with spectators from Boston and the neighboring country. Both the English and French naval commanders, at that time visiting Boston in national ships, expressed their admiration of the model of this vessel; and afterward it was pronounced by naval commanders at Batavia and Canton as perfect as the then state of art would permit." The French squadron referred to consisted of the "Patriot," 74, Admiral De Ponderez, and "Leopard," 74, commanded by Monsieur De la Galissonière. The "Patriot" a few months before had been distinguished by taking that unfortunate monarch, Louis XVI., when visiting Cherbourg, a few leagues into the Atlantic, and giving him a sight of that ocean. The "Leopard" was a splendid ship; and not far below the castle was anchored the "Penelope," 32, an English frigate, commanded by Captain John Linzee, one of the squadron of Vice-Admiral Sir Richard Hughes.

The "Massachusetts" was built under the direction of Major Shaw, for an East India trader; and with Captain Job Prince as commander, and a crew of seventy-five officers and men, with twenty guns mounted, she proceeded on a voyage to Batavia and Canton, where she arrived without accident, notwithstanding the prediction of Moll Pitcher, the famous fortune-teller of Lynn, that the ship would be lost on the voyage and all hands perish. She made the passage to Batavia in one hundred and fifty-eight days, and was sold at Canton, to the Danish East India Company, for $65,000.

Edmund Hart's ship-yard will be ever famous as the place where the U. S. frigate "Constitution" was built. Before the establishment of government dockyards, private yards were used for building our national vessels; and Hart's for a long time went by the name of "Hart's Naval Yard."[1]

The depredations of Algerine corsairs upon our mercantile marine induced Congress to authorize the purchase or building of four ships, to carry forty-four guns each, and two to carry thirty-six guns. Their act was approved by the President, March 27, 1794, and the keel of the "Constitution" was laid by Mr. Hart the November following, and preparations made for setting up her frames. The first official mention of her by name is in a report from a committee on the state of naval equipments, etc., to the United States House of Representatives, dated Jan. 25, 1797, which says: "The frigate building at Boston, called the 'Constitution,' is in such a state of forwardness that it is supposed she can be launched in July."

The "Constitution" was designed by Joshua Humphreys, of Philadelphia, and constructed under the superintendence of Colonel George Claghorne, of New Bedford. Captains Barry, Dale, and Truxton, of the navy, agreed upon her dimensions, with Mr. Humphreys, who prepared the drafts, moulds, and building instructions. It was decided that the frame should be of live-oak and red cedar, the keel, keelson beams, and planking, etc., of the best white oak, decks of the best Carolina pitch-pine, but under the guns to be of oak. John T. Morgan, a master-shipwright of Boston, was sent to Savannah and Charleston to procure the live-oak, red cedar, and pitch-pine for all the frigates. The original draft of the "Constitution" was changed at the suggestion of Colonel Claghorne, to whom her construction was confided. A portion of the timber used was taken from the woods of Allentown, on the borders of the Merrimac, fifty miles from the ship-yard.[2]

[1] On the map of 1722 the yard is designated as "Thornton's," and the site is now covered by Constitution Wharf, — so named because the frigate "Constitution" was built there. The frigates "Constitution" and "Boston," and the brig "Argus" were all built in Hart's Yard. For Hart and his yard, see Drake's *Landmarks*, 181.

[2] Paul Revere furnished the copper bolts and spikes, drawn from malleable copper, by a process then new; and Ephraim Thayer, who had a shop at the South End, made her gun-carriages. Isaac Harris, who worked as an apprentice in the mast yard in 1797, put new masts into the frigate during the war of 1812. To him is conceded, in this country, the honor of first making ships' masts in sections, and he constructed the first masting sheers used at the Charlestown Navy Yard. The anchors were made in Hanover, Plymouth County, Massachusetts, and her sails in the Old Granary building, at the corner of Park and Tremont streets. No other building in Boston

Her first battery — that which she carried throughout the war of 1812, and long after — bore the monogram "G.R.," showing its English origin.

Mr. Hartley, of Boston, was appointed to assist Colonel Claghorne, and Captain Samuel Nicholson, of the navy, exercised a general supervision, aided by General Henry Jackson and Major Gibbs, of Boston, Edmund Hart being the master-carpenter. At last, Sept. 20, 1797, was announced as the day for her launch. Commodore Nicholson left the yard to get his breakfast, with express orders not to hoist any flag over her till his return, designing that honor for his own hands; but during his absence Samuel Bentley, a shipwright and calker, assisted by a comrade named Harris, hoisted the Stars and Stripes, which thus for the first time floated over this historic ship. The Commodore, on his return, expressed himself in words more strong than polite at this disobedience of his orders. People poured into the town from all quarters to witness the launch, and several hundred went over to Noddle's Island to get a better view. The day was pleasant though cold, and the neighboring wharves were crowded with spectators, who were warned that the passage of so large a vessel into the water would create a swell which might endanger their safety. At high water, just twenty minutes after eleven, the signal was given, but the ship would not start until screws and other machinery had been applied, and then she moved only about twenty-seven feet. Mr. Claghorne wrote the Secretary of War: "Concluding some hidden cause had impeded her progress, and the tide ebbing fast, I decided it to be most prudent to block and shore her up, and examine carefully into the cause of the stopping; and found that the ways had settled about an inch, which, added to some other cause of no great importance, had occasioned the obstruction." Her colors were then hauled down, and the multitude dispersed, disappointed and anxious.

The next day the ship was raised two inches by means of wedges; her bilge-ways were then taken out, and apparent defects remedied. Everything being in order, another attempt was made on the 22d, when she moved about thirty-one feet, and then stopped, as though still reluctant to enter her destined element. On examination it was found that the ways erected on the new wharf (which had only been built for her to pass over, and not to rest upon) had settled one and five-eighths of an inch, which the incline of the ways was insufficient to overcome. The vessel might have been forced off, but the constructor decided not to attempt so hazardous a measure. Colonel Claghorne says in his report:

"I had formed the inclined plane upon the smallest angle that I conceived would convey the ship into the water, in order that she might make her plunge with the least violence, and thereby prevent any strain or injury. I must now give the ways more descent, which will remedy the defect occasioned by the settling of the new wharf;

was large enough. The duck for the sails was made by an incorporated company in Boston, in their factory on the corner of Tremont and Boylston streets.

and I am fully confident that the next trial, at high tide, in October, will be attended with success. In the mean time I shall proceed in completing the ship on the stocks."

Saturday, Oct. 21, 1797, — which was noted as the anniversary of Columbus's discovery of America, — a third attempt to launch the ship was made, and proved successful. The day was overcast and cold, with an easterly wind, so but few people assembled.[1] A few specially-invited dignitaries gathered within the narrow limits of the yard; a smaller number, with some ladies, were on her deck. At half-past twelve, all being ready, the commodore stood at the heel of the bowsprit with a bottle of choice Madeira, from the cellar of the Hon. Thomas Russell; at a given signal, the ship slid along the ways and glided into and rested gracefully upon the water, amid a chorus of cheers. As she did so, the commodore broke the bottle over her bow, according to time-honored usage, and baptized her as the good ship "Constitution." She cost, when ready for sea, $302,718.84. She first moved under canvas July 20, 1798, and proceeded to sea on her first cruise, under the command of Commodore Samuel Nicholson, August 13 of the same year.[2]

The frigate "Boston" (the second of that name), of seven hundred tons, was the next ship of war built in Hart's yard. Her rate was to have been a thirty-six, but she only mounted twenty-eight guns. She was designed by Mr. Hart, and built under his superintendence.

The annoyance to which the commerce of our country had been subjected by British and French ships of war, — the former claiming the right of search for British subjects, and the latter capturing our vessels under the pretence that they were carrying contraband goods, — aroused the indignation of the people. To aid in measures of defence, the ladies of Charleston, S. C., built the "John Adams," and tendered her to the Government; the inhabitants of Newburyport and its neighborhood built and presented the "Merrimac;" and the merchants of Salem built and presented the frigate "Essex," the first ship of war of the United States to double both the Capes of Good Hope and Horn. The merchants of Boston, not to be outdone in patriotism, built the frigate "Boston." There were one hundred and four subscribers, whose subscriptions varied from $500 to $10,000. The amount subscribed was $136,500, and the cost of the frigate reached $137,900.[3]

[1] Among the shivering boys who witnessed the launch was the late George Ticknor; who told me that, though cautioned beforehand, he was nearly swept from off the wharf on which he stood by the wave raised by the vessel as she made her plunge into the water.

[2] The history of the "Constitution" has been several times written; once by Cooper, in *Graham's Magazine;* again by Jesse E. Dow, who was Commodore Elliot's secretary when she was his flag-ship in the Mediterranean. This last was printed in the *Democratic Review.*

[3] The *Columbian Centinel* of June 27, 1798, contains the following notice of the first step in the project: —

"*Notice.* — A subscription will be opened this day for the raising of a fund to purchase or build one or more ships of war, to be loaned to this Government for the service of the United States. Those who would wish to join in this testimonial of public spirit are requested to meet in the chamber over Taylor's Insurance Office, at 1 o'clock precisely, to affix their signatures and make the necessary arrangements."

The next issue of the paper, June 30, 1798, has the following announcement: —

In April, 1799, President Adams appointed Captain George Little to be her commander; and the work having been carried on with great rapidity, the "Boston" was launched, in the presence of President Adams, May 20.[1]

Captain Little gave notice July 9, in the newspapers, that "having received sailing orders for the United States frigate 'Boston,' all officers and men belonging to her are ordered to repair on board immediately." July 25, the frigate sailed on a cruise, and the *Centinel* declared her "one of the handsomest-modelled ships in the world." Her subsequent captures of "Le Berceau" and several French privateers are a part of our naval annals. In 1812 the "Boston" was reported unworthy of repair; and in 1814, when the British were advancing on Washington, she was burned, to prevent her falling into the hands of the enemy.

The first legislation looking to the establishment of a government dock-yard is found in a resolve reported from the Naval Committee of the House of Representatives, Jan. 25, 1797, recommending an appropriation for that purpose. The following spring a Navy Department was established; and April 25, 1800, we find the Hon. Benjamin Stoddard, Secretary of the Navy, writing to the President: "At Boston, the old yard, besides being private

"THE NERVE. — In compliance with the advertisement in the last *Centinel*, a number of citizens of this metropolis met at Taylor's Insurance Office, for the purpose of opening a patriotic and voluntary subscription in aid of Government. Last evening the amount subscribed amounted to $115,250; and as the subscription still remains open, we have not the least doubt that Boston will outdo every city in the Union in Federal patriotism. We will not omit mentioning that the Hon. William Phillips added $10,000 to this free-will offering. God bless him for it!"

[Among the subscribers are the following: William Phillips, $10,000; David Sears, Stephen Higginson, Eben Parsons, John Codman, Joseph Coolidge & Son, Theodore Lyman, Boot and Pratt, Thomas Dickinson, $3,000 each; Samuel Parkman and Samuel Eliot, $4,000 each; Benjamin Joy, James and T. H. Perkins, Thomas Walley, John Parker, Stephen Higginson, Jr., Abiel Smith, Thomas C. Amory, $1,500 each; St. Andrew's Lodge, $1,000; Benjamin and Nathaniel Goddard, and Josiah Quincy, $500. — ED.]

Less than two months later, Aug. 22, 1798, the papers say: "The keel of a thirty-six gun frigate is now laying at Mr. Hart's navy yard."

[1] The *Columbian Centinel* of Wednesday, May 22, contains the following notice of the launch: —

"*More Wooden Walls.* — On Monday last, at noon, the frigate 'Boston,' of 32 guns, was launched from the Navy (Hart's) Yard, in this town, in the presence of THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES, HIS HONOR THE LIEUTENANT-GOVERNOR of Massachusetts, and an immense concourse of spectators.

"Her entrance into the bottom of the elements, the *rights* of which she is destined to ascertain and defend, was announced by a Federal discharge from Captain Gardner's artillery, by salutes from the shipping in the harbor, and by the loud and reiterated huzzas of the citizens. The launch was effected without the least accident or interruption, and complete harmony operated every movement. A more excellent piece of naval architecture cannot be produced in the United States. The dispatch used in her construction, the neatness of her workmanship, with the superior quality and durability of her materials, do honor to Captain Hart, the master-builder, to Captain Little, her commander, the superintending committee of subscribers, and to the mechanics of the town. She is about 800 tons, and has the figure of an aboriginal warrior for her head. The President of the United States was escorted to and from the Navy Yard by a committee of subscribers and a procession of civil and military officers, and was welcomed and addressed by the acclamations of all ranks of citizens, a full brass band of music in uniform, and discharges from Captain Gardner's artillery."

"The rigging and equipment of the Boston frigate," says the *Centinel* of May 29, "are progressing with patriotic celerity." June 9, the same paper says: "The Boston frigate is almost completed; she bids fair to do honor to her namesake." June 12: "The Boston frigate yesterday hauled off into the stream. The enlistment of her crew progresses rapidly."

property, and too confined to contain the timber of a 74-gun ship, is so much surrounded by wooden houses as to be thought too dangerous a situation for building a valuable ship, especially a ship that might remain long upon the stocks. At this place, or rather at Charlestown, there is a very proper situation for a building-yard; but the ground cannot be obtained for less than eighteen thousand dollars." The secretary recommended the purchase of land for a government dockyard at Boston, "notwithstanding the high price which must be paid for the grounds." Mr. Humphreys, the naval constructor, who was sent to the eastward to view the situations about Boston and Portsmouth, extended his examination of harbors as far as Portland and Wiscasset, and reported that "he could find nowhere within a convenient distance of Boston a situation so eligible in all respects as Charlestown." Boston, he thought, "from the natural strength of its situation, the great number of ship-carpenters in its vicinity, and of its seamen, must always remain a building-place, and a place of rendezvous for our navy of the first importance; while the rise of tide, eleven feet, would greatly lessen the expense of emptying a dock," etc. He adds: "The outer harbor of President and Nantasket roads affords a large and safe harbor for large fleets from the weather; and the inner harbor, safe from winds, freshets, and enemy, could be securely fortified at an easy expense." After an examination of Noddle's Island (East Boston), — concerning which Admiral Montague is said to have remarked, "God Almighty made Noddle's Island on purpose for a dockyard," — Mr. Humphreys concludes his report by recommending the purchase of twenty-three acres, at Charlestown, for $19,350.[1]

Negotiations for the purchase of land at Charlestown were continued through the agency of Dr. Aaron Putnam, but were not completed until October.

On March 13, 1801, the secretary enclosed to the Messrs. Higginson,[2] the navy agents in Boston, a letter from Captain Samuel Nicholson [3] of complaint against them, which they were desired to explain, which is the first

[1] It is curious to compare his estimate of the cost of the land, which is about $841 per acre, with its present value in the same neighborhood, which is $2 and $3 per square foot. Ultimately forty-three acres of land were bought at Charlestown, for dockyard purposes, for $39,214. There was no direct authority from Congress to purchase this or any other dockyard. They were all bought under the appropriation of $1,000,000 for the building of six 74-gun ships, etc. The executive was seriously censured by the opposition party for having made these purchases without express authority; but the wisdom of the measure was undoubted. On March 1, 1801, the sum of $500,000 was appropriated for expenses upon the six 74-gun ships, and "for *completing* navy yards." This was the first appropriation recognizing their existence, though prior to that date $199,030.92 had been expended in their purchase and improvement.

[2] On April 1, 1801, Samuel Brown, Esq., succeeded Messrs. Higginson & Co., as navy agent, and held the office for six years until he resigned, Aug. 15, 1807. It was a much more important office in those early days of the Navy than subsequently; and there were frequent conflicts of authority between the navy agent and commandant which had to be settled by higher authority.

[3] He was born in Maryland in 1743, and entered the naval service as a lieutenant during the Revolutionary war, and was promoted a captain, Sept. 17, 1779, in the Continental Navy; on the reorganization, June 10, 1794, he was commissioned a captain in the United States Navy, to rank next below Captain John Barry.

mention of his name in connection with the Yard at Charlestown, of which he was the first superintendent (as the title went) and remained the commandant until his death, Dec. 29, 1811. Meanwhile, and before the Yard was ready for occupancy, the Government had decided to build a brig at Boston, and her keel was laid in Mr. Hart's yard. The making of the contracts was assigned to Captain Edward Preble. She measured two hundred and ninety-eight tons, and was named the "Argus," carried sixteen guns, and cost $37,428. After being one of the most successful of our small cruisers, and noted for her achievements in the war against Tripoli, and in that of 1812, she was captured in the English Channel by H. B. M. brig "Pelican," on the 14th of August, 1813.

THE ORIGINAL PURCHASE.

We learn from the log-book[1] of the "Constitution," that "at 10 A. M., May 21, 1803, Commodore Preble came on board the ship, and as *commodore* took charge of her, lying at her moorings off the Navy Yard where she had been, being in ordinary, ten months and fourteen days." In making ready for the cruise which was to take him to Tripoli, the ship was recoppered. The log-book on the 26th of June records: "The carpenters gave nine cheers, which were answered by the seamen and calkers, because they had in fourteen days completed coppering the ship with copper *made in the States*."[2]

In August the "Constitution" sailed for the Mediterranean, where she earned for herself the well known sobriquet of "Old Ironsides."

In 1807 Samuel Brown resigned the position of Navy Agent, which was esteemed at that time more important than the office of Superintendent or Commandant of the Navy Yard, and Francis Johonnot, Esq., was appointed to succeed him; and on July 23, 1808, the secretary directs the latter "not to allow or pay for any repairs to the house occupied by the commandant, other than those previously authorized by the department." This is the first mention made of the commandant's house in the official records, which substantially as it now stands had been one of the earliest improvements of the yard.[3]

[1] A copy of which is preserved in the Library and Institute at the Navy Yard.

[2] The copper was in fact made by Paul Revere, as a correspondence on file in the Navy Department shows. In the recent celebration of the two hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the settlement of Boston, the very blocks used to heave out the "Constitution" on this occasion were carried in the procession.

[3] [A view of this house from the yard, taken about 1826 and showing the hills behind and the Mystic, is given in Drake's *Landmarks of Middlesex*, p. 27, in which book chapter ii. is given to "An Hour in the Government Dock Yard." — Ed.] This engraving is from a painting by Mrs. Armstrong, wife of the late Commodore Armstrong, which is now in the Naval Library and Institute.

The year 1811 closed with the death of Commodore Samuel Nicholson,[1] the first commandant of the station, who died on the 29th of December, and was buried from the commandant's house, Jan. 2, 1812, with the accustomed honors, in the presence of the officers of the Army and Navy stationed or living in the vicinity, the Massachusetts Society of the Cincinnati, of which he was a member, the officers and members of King Solomon's Lodge of Free and Accepted Masons, and of the several lodges in Boston in full regalia. At the time of his death he was sixty-nine years of age; he was buried under Christ Church in Boston. During his administration the appropriations had been scanty, and only such improvements undertaken as were essential. The shot and timber stored in Boston had been removed to the Yard. The commandant's house, a brick store-house,[2] marine barracks, a hospital and powder magazine, the latter occupied jointly by the war and navy department, and a wharf with a few temporary sheds were all the improvements that had been accomplished. In fact the annual expenditures for improvements for *all* the yards which had been purchased from 1802 to 1811 only averaged about $40,000.

No one seems to have been ordered to fill the vacancy in the office of commandant until March, 1812, when Commodore William Bainbridge was ordered here. He had been in Russia, engaged in mercantile speculations; but, hearing rumors of a probable war with Great Britain, hastened home, and arriving in Boston in February proceeded at once to Washington, where he reported himself for service, and was in a few weeks ordered to the command of the Boston Navy Yard. At that time the Yard possessed hardly a convenience for building or repairing vessels, or laying them up in ordinary. This was a state of things which the active mind of Bainbridge used every means in his power to remedy. He proceeded at once to examine and survey the harbor and its channels, and made frequent communications to the Government, in which he detailed the security which our commerce would receive from an extensive establishment at Charlestown. Among his reasons for such an establishment, he states that the distance of the Yard from the sea precluded the possibility of surprise, and the channel commanded by Forts Independence and Warren rendered it impossible for any armament then known to advance within gunshot of the Yard without being demolished; also that the harbor was never closed, and being seldom obstructed by ice could be safely navigated at all times, and could not be effectually blockaded. This last opinion of the commodore was abundantly proved during the war of 1812–14, as throughout it national and merchant vessels proceeded to sea whenever convenient to them, without incurring any very great risk. The President was opposed at first to the commodore's views, but such was Bainbridge's zeal and perseverance that the President at last reluctantly authorized a limited appropriation for the Yard. Previous to

[1] Two brothers, James and John, were distinguished commanders in the Continental Navy.

[2] This building is still standing at the entrance of the Yard; and the second story is mainly occupied by the Museum and Library of the Naval Library and Institute, organized in 1843 [and largely encouraged by the writer of this chapter. — Ed.]

the commodore's appointment on Jan. 23, 1812, the Navy Agent, Johonnot, had been removed because of "personal afflictions which rendered him inca-



COMMODORE HULL.[1]

pable of performing his active duties," and Amos Binney was commissioned to the office, which he continued to fill for fourteen years, or until 1826.[2]

When war was declared with Great Britain, Commodore Murray was

[1] [This cut follows a portrait painted in 1813 or 1814, by Stuart, belonging to the family, and now in the Boston Art Museum. Hull dated his despatch announcing his victory over the "Guerrière," "Off Boston Light;" and as his ship came up the harbor she was greeted with acclamations from a flotilla of gaily decorated vessels. An artillery company gave him a national salute as he landed, and a procession conducted him to his lodgings; and at a public banquet, when nearly six hundred sat down, a stirring ode was sung, which had been written by Lucius Manlius Sargent. — Ed.]

[2] On April 28, 1812, Paul Hamilton, Secretary of the Navy, addressed Commodore Bainbridge for the first time as "Commandant," — a title ever since retained for the commanding officer of our Navy Yards, whatever his naval rank and title. [See General Palfrey's chapter in the present volume. — Ed.]

at the head of the Navy, but too old and infirm for active service. Commodore John Rodgers stood next on the list. James Barron came third, but he was abroad; and Bainbridge was the fourth. This entitled the last to a command afloat, which he hastened to claim. The three best frigates had gone to sea in quest of the enemy, but he was at once ordered to the "Constellation," 38, fitting at Norfolk, Virginia; and on the 15th of July Captain C. R. Perry was temporarily appointed superintendent of the Yard, until Commodore Bainbridge should return to the station, or some other officer be appointed. Two days later, Lieutenant Stephen Cassin opened a rendezvous in Boston to recruit able seamen for the "Constellation;" and on the 28th Captain Perry was relieved by Captain Gordon. On the 9th of August, only twenty-one days after his detachment, Bainbridge was ordered "to proceed to Boston and resume command of the Navy Yard and the gunboats at that place, and at Kennebunk, Saco, and Portland, until the 'Constellation' is prepared for service."

On the 28th of July the frigate "Constitution," Captain Isaac Hull, arrived at Boston after her escape[1] from the British squadron under Commo-

[1] [This famous escape, by which Hull gained so much credit, and which he shared with Lieutenant Morris, is minutely described in Captain George Coggeshall's *American Privateers*, p. 10; and on p. 25 will be found an account of the "Constitution's" action with the "Guerrière." It is of course enlarged upon by the usual authorities, — Cooper's *Naval History*, on the American side, and James's *Naval History of Great Britain*, on the enemy's side. The latter's reputation for candor, however, is not good. In *Colburn's United Service Magazine*, November and December, 1880, there are articles by Captain Bedford Pim, R. N., and Sir E. J. Reed, K. C. B., on "The Naval War of 1812 with the United States." Of the privateer and letter of marque service of the war, Coggeshall, who himself commanded two such craft, gives the fullest account, published (1856) indeed over forty years after the war had closed, and he claims to give the names of all or nearly all such vessels. The book is not very readable, being mostly such an enumeration. He chronicles two hundred and fifty vessels sent out to capture British merchantmen, and to have a brush as they could with the British cruisers. Of this number, Baltimore sent out fifty-eight; New York, fifty-five; Salem, forty; and Boston standing fourth on the list, thirty-one, whose names, as Coggeshall gives them, are: "Abaellino," "Argus," "Avon," "Blakely," "Brutus," "Catharine," "Champlain," "Charles Morris," "Charles Stewart," "Curlew," "Dromo," "Fame," "George Little," "Gossamer," "Hunter," "Hyder Ali," "Ida," "Ino," "Jacob Jones," "Joel Barlow," "Leo," "Macdonough," "Macedonian," "Rambler," "Ranger," "Rapid," "Reindeer," "Sine quanon," "Sphinx," "Volant," "Wily Reynard" A condensed account of this service is given in Lossing's *Field Book of the War of* 1812, but Boston hardly appears in it. — Ed.] Oct. 13, 1812, — the Privateer Schooner "Fame," which had seen service as a privateer during the Revolutionary War, returned from a cruise of fifteen days, having captured two schooners. The "Hyder Ali," of Boston, Captain Thorndike, was captured in the East Indies by the British Frigate "Owen Glendower," after having taken nine prizes, all of which, however, were recaptured. One of the most famous privateers of the war, the "True Blooded Yankee," was owned by Mr. Henry, a brother of Commodore Edward Preble, and was commissioned from Boston under the American flag, though fitted out and sailing from French ports, her owner being temporarily a resident of France. She was commanded first by Captain Hailey, and subsequently by Thomas Oxnard, a nephew of her owner. She cruised a greater part of the war in the British and Irish channels, making many rich prizes which were generally sent into French ports, though a few were sent to the United States. One ship sent into Brest, was said to be worth $500,000; one laden with dry goods and Irish linens was ordered to the United States, and the ship "Industry" was sent to Bergen, in Norway, and there sold.

When the "True Blooded Yankee" arrived in France from one of her cruises, she was laden with the following spoils: 18 bales of Turkey carpets, 43 bales of raw silk weighing 12,000 pounds, 20 boxes of gums, 46 packs of the best skins, 24 packs of beaver skins, 160 dozen of swans' skins, 190 hides, copper, etc. In 1813, during a cruise of thirty-seven days, she captured

dore Broke, and sailing again on the 2d of August she returned on the 30th, having in her cruise of less than a month captured four brigs, mounting thirty guns, and H. B. M. frigate "Guerrière," of forty-nine guns.

On the 1st of September a rendezvous was opened to ship a crew for the frigate "Chesapeake," Captain Evans, — which ship sailed from Boston on the 13th of December. The frigates "United States" and "President" also sailed on the 8th of October, the latter returning to Boston on the 31st of December.

From a detailed report made by Commodore Bainbridge, it appears that the expenditures for accommodations, repairs of buildings, etc., for the years 1811–1812 only amounted to $5,752.43; but during the first year of the war nearly $250,000 were expended principally for the repairs of vessels.[1]

About this time Captain Isaac Hull, having obtained his meed of glory and desiring to attend to his private affairs, was relieved of the command of the "Constitution;" and Captain William Bainbridge at his own request was transferred to the command of that frigate.[2] A small squadron, consisting of the "Constitution," "Essex," and "Hornet," was placed under the command of Bainbridge, and Sept. 15, 1812, he hoisted his broad pennant as Commodore on board the "Constitution" at Boston, and sailed thence on the 26th of October, in company with the "Hornet."[3] The "Constitution" on this cruise captured H. B. M. frigate "Java," and returned to Boston on the 27th of February, after an absence of only four months. Bainbridge landed the next morning on the end of Long Wharf, and amidst the roaring of cannon was received by the officers and citizens of distinction, and escorted up

twenty-seven vessels and made two hundred and seventy prisoners; and also took possession of an island on the coast of Ireland, and held it six days. She also took a town in Scotland, and burned seven vessels in the harbor. In 1814 she cruised in the British Channel in company with the privateer "Bunker Hill," of fourteen guns and one hundred and forty men, with orders to divest her prizes of their valuable articles and then to sink them and destroy them, but not to send them into port. Such was the terror she inspired, that it is said a reward was offered for her capture and that of her captain dead or alive. Captain Thomas Oxnard settled in France after the war, having married a French lady, and died at Marseilles, June 14, 1840; on his death-bed he requested that his body should be shrouded in the American Flag.

[1] The following vessels of war were repaired at the Yard at the following costs: "John Adams," $33,579.33; "Chesapeake," $105,991.07; "Constitution," $46,638.46; "President," $14,928.04; "United States," $21,589.85; "Congress," $5,681.51; "Hornet," $5,430.73; "Nautilus," $400.84; "Argus," $9,052.94; Four gunboats, etc., $1,932.31, — total, $245,225.13. These repairs were done at daily wages, at the following rates: master carpenter from $3 50 to $4.00 a day; sawyers at $1.50 a day; joiners at $1.25 a day; laborers at $1.00 a day. The working hours were from sunrise to sunset.

[2] The secretary, September 8, wrote to Bainbridge: "Captain Hull having asked to be relieved of the command of the 'Constitution,' you will immediately take command of that frigate and prepare her for service. Until your return to the yard, Captain Hull will relieve you in the command. Should this command be inconvenient to Captain Hull, you will appoint Mr. Morris [Lieutenant, afterwards Commodore Charles Morris, the greatest man our navy has yet produced] to that station." Mr. Morris had been the first lieutenant of Hull on the recent cruise of the "Constitution." [An autobiography of Morris, with a photograph of a portrait of him by Ary Scheffer, is given in No. 12 of the *U. S. Naval Institute Proceedings*. — Ed.] It has also been reprinted in a separate pamphlet. Mr. Corcoran is now having an extensive biography of the Commodore, his father-in-law, prepared.

[3] The "Essex" sailed from the Delaware to join him at sea, but never did; her subsequent adventurous career and honorable capture in the Pacific it is unnecessary to repeat here.

State Street by the New England Guards to the Exchange Coffee-house, greeted all along the route with loud huzzas. The streets through which he



passed and the merchant ships in the harbor were decorated with flags, and a public dinner was given to him on the 2d of March by the citizens.

Before Commodore Bainbridge's return Congress had authorized the building of three line-of-battle ships. One of these was to be laid down at the Boston Yard, and he was ordered to superintend its construction. Having, like his compeer Hull, obtained his victory, Bainbridge resigned the command of the "Constitution," March, 1813, and resumed charge of the Navy Yard and the Eastern naval station, which included at that time all the floating force in Rhode Island, New Hampshire, and Maine. On the 25th of February preceding, the secretary had informed Captain Hull that his command extended to every gunboat eastward of Boston, and to all the floating force attached to Portsmouth and Portland, but that the Navy Yard at Portsmouth was in charge of the Navy Agent there.

Early in 1813 preparation was made at the Yard, under a contract with the Harts, father and son, to build a seventy-four. Her frame had been moulded in 1798–1800, in conformity with a draft then made. Commodore Bainbridge had suggested improvements in her form and dimensions which were found under the circumstances impracticable. The result was as he predicted; she was found when launched to carry her lower deck ports too low, and was finally razeed into one of the finest sailing frigates ever produced in our own or any other service. Her keel was laid Aug. 18, 1813, and work was pushed on her so that she was ready for launching the following June.

The *Columbian Centinel* of the 18th of June, 1814, says: —

"The 'Independence' of seventy-four guns will be launched this day from the Navy Yard in Charlestown. Those who wish to see the launch will do well to be in the vicinity by half-past eleven o'clock to avoid disappointment. We have no doubt of the strength of Charlestown bridge; but prudence requires that the numbers admitted thereon should be limited if possible. It is recommended that the eastern side be appropriated to the ladies. We think the view from Copp's Hill will be the best."

The launch, however, was not successful on that day, for the *Centinel* announces that owing to the accidental removal of the tallow from a part of the ways the ship was only advanced about seventy-six feet. An attempt to launch her the following day by mechanical power also failed; and her ways had to be relaid. At last, on the 22d, at three o'clock P.M., she moved grandly off, and was welcomed by a Federal salute from the frigate "Constitution" and the acclamations of many thousands of spectators. The salute was returned by the Navy-Yard battery, and subsequently the workmen employed in her construction "were sumptuously entertained in the rigging-loft, and spent the day in hilarity." An officer of the "Constitution," whose name is not given, had the honor of christening this the first line-of-battle ship added to our navy.[1]

[1] The good old ship still exists, though no more fit for the sea; and after a variety of active service has long been the receiving-ship at the Mare Island Navy Yard, California. The "Independence" was not the first vessel of war launched from the Boston Yard, the sloop-of-war "Frolic" having been launched on Sept. 11 preceding. The "Frolic" sailed from Boston Feb. 18, 1814, commanded by Master Commandant Joseph Bainbridge (a brother of the com-

In a letter to the secretary, dated Aug. 21, 1813, Commodore Bainbridge proposed to construct houses over the ships then building at Charlestown and Portsmouth. The men thus protected he thought would work with more celerity, neatness, and efficiency, and the vessels might remain on the stocks until required without suffering material deterioration, — an opinion which has been supported by the results.[1] The advantages were made so apparent to the secretary, that on the 26th he authorized the erection of ship-houses (as they are called) not only at Portsmouth and Boston, but at all the navy yards in the United States. Sir Robert Seppings, the distinguished British naval architect, learned from this experiment the great advantage of such structures, and at his suggestion the Board of Admiralty directed similar buildings to be erected in the principal dock-yards of the United Kingdom.

The "Chesapeake" having returned to Boston April 9, 1813, Captain Evans was soon after relieved by Captain James Lawrence, who, having recruited her crew and refitted her, sailed from President Roads on June 1, and was captured the same day in sight of the port by H. B. M. ship "Shannon," which she had gone out to encounter.[2]

When the "Constitution" had returned from the cruise in which she captured the "Java," Captain Charles Stewart relieved Bainbridge, who then resumed command of the Yard. The ship having been thoroughly repaired, the Department on September 19 wrote to hurry her departure; she did not, however, get to sea until December 30, when she ran the

modore); and after making one or two prizes was herself captured by H. B. M. frigate "Orpheus" and schooner "Shelbourne," April 20, 1814, after a chase of sixty hours.

[1] The house from which the "Independence" was launched — the first of the kind ever erected — is marked No. 1 on the plan of 1823. The "Vermont" (74) was built in it, and launched from under it in 1848, after which it was pulled down, and a portion of its material used in the construction of additions to the officers' houses in the northeastern extremity of the yard. There is now a smaller house erected over the same ways from which in 1874 the iron torpedo-boat "Intrepid," the first vessel of the kind added to our navy, was launched.

[2] The inhabitants of Boston watched the battle with intense and anxious interest from the house-tops and adjoining eminences; they could see the smoke and hear the distant cannonade. Some of the citizens who went outside the harbor hurried back sadly when they saw the result. It was the last, as it was the only, sound of hostile cannon heard in Boston for the last hundred years. This is not the place, nor is there room, to describe the action in full, which the writer has narrated elsewhere. [See *The United Service*, October, 1879, for "The Chesapeake and Shannon," by G. H. Preble. Fac-similes from Lawrence's last letter written just before leaving port, and from the British Captain Broke's challenge (which did not reach Boston by way of Salem till after the "Chesapeake" had gone out to sea) are given in Lossing's account of the action in his *Field-book of the War of* 1812, p 702. A memoir of Lawrence was written at the time by Washington Irving in the *Analectic Magazine*, then edited by him, and it is now included in his *Spanish Papers, etc.*, ii. 37; Irving had the advantage of a conference with an officer of the "Chesapeake" who survived the fight. See also *Harper's Monthly*, xxiv. A portrait of Captain Lawrence in uniform, by Stuart, is owned by his granddaughter, Mrs. William Redmond, Newport, R. I. Mason's *Stuart*, p. 212. — Ed.] By the loss of the "Chesapeake" our naval signals fell into the hands of the enemy, which rendered a new code necessary; and Commodores Bainbridge, Decatur, and Hull were appointed to perform that duty. His associates being otherwise occupied on important duties, Commodore Bainbridge prepared and transmitted the new code, which was approved and adopted by the Department. He also, with Commodore Hull, about the same time prepared rules and regulations for the government of officers in repairing and equipping the vessels of the navy.

blockade of seven of the enemy's ships. After a short cruise, in which she captured the schooner "Picton" of fourteen guns and three merchant vessels, she was finally chased into Marblehead.[1]

Rumors and reports of large ships of war having been seen off the coast kept the town in a continual state of ferment. Captain Sullivan, of the New England Guards, presented a statement of the defenceless condition of the harbor to the selectmen, which caused them to announce that a committee of the board would attend every day at 11 o'clock A.M. at Faneuil Hall to receive communications and suggestions. The Adjutant-General of the Commonwealth also gave notice that in case of an attack during the day two guns would be fired rapidly, and a red flag hoisted in the Navy Yard; and if at night, three guns would be fired, two lanterns hoisted at the Navy Yard, and the church bells tolled for half an hour.[2] The Navy Yard was so defenceless that little resistance could have been offered, and fears were expressed for the "Independence," then ready to be launched; and in June, when the enemy appeared in force off the harbor, Commodore Bainbridge entered into correspondence with General John Brooks, the Adjutant-General of Massachusetts, suggesting measures for its defence. In consequence of which the following General Order was issued: —

"Headquarters, *Boston*, June 13, 1814.

"Commodore Bainbridge having solicited the services of the Company of New-England Guards, commanded by Captain George Sullivan, for the defence of the Navy Yard in Charlestown, and that corps having voluntarily expressed their ready disposition to meet the wishes of the Commodore, the Commander-in-Chief consents to the arrangement, and orders Captain Sullivan to march without delay to that post, where he will continue his command until further orders; or otherwise until the object for which the services were requested is accomplished.

"By his Excellency's command,

"J. Brooks, *Adjutant-General.*"

In response to this order, on the afternoon of the 13th the Guards assembled to the number of sixty-one, and with their six-pounders and baggage encamped in the evening on the eminence above the magazine. Two eighteen-pounders and the company's six-pounders were planted to com-

[1] On April 3, when the news came from the commandant of the Navy Yard that the "Constitution" was threatened by three frigates of the enemy, the New-England Guards of Boston volunteered to march to her defence. Leaving their armory at 7 o'clock, P.M., they halted in front of the commandant's house, where they were informed by Commodore Bainbridge that he would proceed at 1 o'clock A.M. with heavy artillery, and requested them to go on in advance; they were, however, overtaken by his verbal order and directed to return, when, it having been ascertained that the "Constitution" was safe in Salem harbor, the company was dismissed, — not, however, before it was discovered that in their haste they had marched on *without a supply of ammunition*. One of the company was Abbott Lawrence, afterward our minister to England; and when the company was hastily summoned, Lawrence, unwilling to be left behind, started on the march in pump-soled shoes, which soon became so uncomfortable that when the company was halted on Chelsea Bridge he bartered them with a countryman for a thick pair of brogans, giving him five dollars additional in exchange.

[2] [A statement of the protective measures taken at this time is given in General Palfrey's chapter on "Boston Soldiery in War and Peace" in the present volume. — Ed.]

mand Chelsea Bridge, over which it was apprehended an attack might be made, and the camp of sixteen tents was fronted in the same direction. The next day was occupied in raising breastworks; sham-fights and drills followed for three days. A portion of each day was employed by them in raising an embankment, which was completed on Sunday, and named "The Guard's Fort." The Guards having assisted at the subsequent attempts to launch the seventy-four, they were dismissed by the Commodore the next day with his thanks for their services.[1]

No sooner was the "Independence" in the water, than Commodore Bainbridge hoisted his broad pennant on her, and guns were placed on board. She was then anchored in connection with the "Constitution" so as to rake the harbor and enfilade any squadron of boats which might attempt to carry the Navy Yard. Twenty-four cannon were mounted on three small batteries on the eastern embankment of the Navy Yard, and a line of palisades was stretched across the wharf. Some heavy cannon which commanded the entrance of the Yard were placed in the rear of them; guns were also placed so as to rake the entrance to the Mystic River.[2]

[1] [The New England Guards had been organized September, 1812, with Samuel Swett for Captain. *Proceedings at the Fiftieth Anniversary of the New England Guards*, Oct. 15, 1862. — ED.]

[2] A committee from the governor and council waited upon the commodore and requested him to remove the "Independence" and "Constitution" below the fort; but he declined doing so, as the fort could not co-operate with them, and because in that position they would be subject to the same fire as the fleet of the enemy. The committee argued that the public ships being the exclusive object of attack, if they remained where he had placed them, would draw the fire of the enemy on the towns of Boston and Charlestown, and involve them in the ruin of the national property. Bainbridge replied with some warmth that Government had confided to him an important command, and no temporizing expedients would induce him to alter the system of defence which he had planned. He was asked, "Should the people of Boston decline all measures of defence in consequence of his refusing to move the ships to the places proposed, whether *that* would not induce him to yield?" He firmly replied, "No, nor any other consideration whatever. If," he added, "the people of Boston should refuse to defend their houses and property, they would have themselves alone to blame." The public property did not belong to any particular *administration*, but to the *nation*, and he regretted to observe that a very small proportion of the citizens should, in manifesting a hostility to the one, give evidence of a want of proper zeal in their duty to the other; he as an American would do all that was incumbent upon him as an officer of the United States. Bainbridge further informed the committee that he would defend his command to the last extremity, let the consequences be what they might. If the citizens chose to separate their interests from those of the nation, the consequences must fall where they were deserved; duty and honor dictated the course which he should pursue. Individual influence in vain was brought to bear upon him to induce him to change his plan of defence, and he continued to devote all his energies to the organization and proper disposition of his force.

It was proposed about this time to obstruct the entrances of the harbor by sinking ships, but this was strenuously objected to by Commodore Bainbridge; and his course in this was approved by the Secretary of the Navy, who, in a long letter dated July 16, 1814, says: "It is difficult to imagine a case so absurd as the right of a State, much less a corporate body, to block up a harbor of the United States in which their naval arsenals are established and their fleets prepared to seek the enemy." He adds in conclusion: "What you have proposed to the town of Boston as a substitute for the ruinous measure contemplated by its marine committee appears to me to be well adapted to the occasion, and fully adequate to the end. You will therefore persevere in temperate expostulation, and the President trusts the committee will ultimately see the superior advantages of your plan of defence, and the manifest objections to the course they propose to pursue." If they still persisted, the commodore was ordered to report the nature and extent of the projected obstructions, and the probable time of their being placed.

The danger evidently increasing towards autumn, Major-General Dearborn received instructions from the President for the defence of the north-eastern military district; and there ensued a conflict of authority between him and the State authorities as to his right to call out and command the militia as garrisons of the forts on the seaboard. The variance of opinion between the State and national executives tended greatly to increase the general alarm. Meetings were called all along the seaboard to recommend strong measures for the common defence. The citizens of Boston were called upon to assemble; and impressed by the eloquence of their chairman, the Hon. Harrison Gray Otis, they adopted without hesitation all the measures which had been suggested to him in a letter from Commodore Bainbridge, under date Sept. 3, 1811. The militia was called out, redoubts and breastworks were erected, and hulks were moored in the channel, prepared to be sunk. The British commanding officer, on learning of these preparations, and that the spirit of the people was aroused, wisely withdrew from his contemplated attack, and turned his course to the South.

Relieved from these apprehensions of attack, the commodore urged on the completion of the "Independence;" and on October 22 he wrote to the secretary unofficially: "I feel extremely anxious to get to sea this winter to establish the fact that we are able successfully to fight Great Britain in other classes of vessels than frigates and sloops of war. . . . It will take, comparatively speaking, but a small sum to get the 'Independence' to sea; and if she is sent, I pledge my life you will be gratified with the cruise." Unfortunately the guns of the "Independence" were at the Washington Navy Yard, and could not be transported by land in the winter, and the danger of their capture forbade a conveyance by sea; and in consequence she did not get to sea until after the end of the war.[1]

Peace having been declared, there was a cessation of activity in all our navy yards, which was felt in Boston as elsewhere, and improvements in progress or projected came to a standstill.

The declaration of war with Algiers on March 2, 1815, created a temporary excitement; and Commodore Bainbridge, having been appointed to command our Mediterranean squadron, was relieved by Commodore Isaac Hull as commandant of the station. Hoisting his broad pennant on the "Independence," Bainbridge sailed from Boston July 3, 1815, accompanied by the "Erie," "Chippewa," and "Lynx." A squadron which had sailed from New York under Commodore Decatur was united to his command; so that after his arrival in the Mediterranean his force consisted of eighteen or twenty sail, being the largest squadron which had ever been fitted out by the United States.

[1] We learn from an official source that during the war, notwithstanding the port was blockaded for a greater part of the time, the following United States vessels of war passed in and out of Boston, — namely, *Frigates:* "Constitution," seven times; "President," four times; "United States," twice; "Chesapeake," three times; "Congress," four times. *Sloops of war:* "Hornet," twice; "Frolic," once; "John Adams," once. *Brigs of war:* "Argus," twice; "Nautilus," four times; "Rattlesnake" twice; "Siren," twice.

Our difficulty with Algiers having been satisfactorily and honorably adjusted, the squadron under Bainbridge — consisting of two frigates, seven brigs, and three schooners — sailed from Gibraltar October 6, and arrived at Newport, Rhode Island, Nov. 15, 1815. After distributing his force between Boston and New York where the vessels were to be laid up, Bainbridge sailed in the "Independence" for Boston, where he arrived Dec. 7, 1815, having been absent five months. The "Independence" was retained in commission as a guard-ship, flying Bainbridge's pennant as Port Captain, which is the first instance of that office being created in our navy. He continued in command of her and of the Boston station for several years, Commodore Hull commanding at the Navy Yard. During this period the "Independence" was fully officered and two-thirds manned, and was kept in a perfect state of discipline and efficiency.

Three days after his arrival Bainbridge addressed a letter[1] to Chaplain Cheever Felch, establishing the first naval school for *officers* ever organized in our navy, and which may therefore be said to be the parent of our present naval academy at Annapolis.

In 1816 an official journal of the proceedings at the Yard — a sort of shore log-book — was commenced, which has been continued down to the present time, affording a good index of all the principal events.[2]

[1] UNITED STATES SHIP "INDEPENDENCE," *Boston Harbor*, Dec. 10, 1815.

SIR, — I have to direct that you open a naval school within the Navy Yard at Charlestown, in such apartments as Captain Hull may assign to you, for the purpose of instructing the officers of the squadron in those branches of mathematics which appertain to their profession. The school must be opened every day in the week, Sunday excepted. The hours of study must be from nine A.M. to one P.M. You will daily report to me the officers who attend. Once a fortnight you will make to me a general report of the respective branches of study in which each officer is engaged, accompanied with candid remarks on their conduct, attention, and progress.

I am, etc.,

WILLIAM BAINBRIDGE.

The Rev. Mr. FELCH.

[2] The first volumes are in the elegant handwriting of sailing-master Charles F. Waldo, and open with the following "List of officers attached to the Navy Yard, Charlestown, Mass., Jan. 1, 1816: Isaac Hull, commandant; Richard M. Winters, lieutenant; Samuel R. Trevett, Jr. and John A. Kearney, surgeons; Lewis Deblois, purser; Joseph Cross, Thomas B. Tilden, and Edmund M. Russell, midshipmen; Abram Walton, boatswain; Matthew Rogers, gunner; Charles F. Waldo and Robert Knox, sailing-masters; Benjamin H. Fosdick, commandant's clerk; Thomas J. H. Cushing, assistant-surgeon; Stephen G. Clarke, master's mate; John Johnson, gunner; William ———, quartermaster; Francis Wyman, purser's steward; B. Evans, carpenter, — total, nineteen officers. Petty officers: one armorer's mate; one sailing-master's mate; one carpenter's mate; four men with gunner (for 'Constitution'); three boys (officers'); two attendants at commandant's; two cooks (hulk and gunboat); one mate for ditto; one gunner's yeoman (Dick Dunn); and nine men to work in the yard, — forty-four *in toto*."

Major Caleb Gibbs was at this time, as he had been for many years, the naval storekeeper. The Secretary of the Navy, addressing Commodore Hull concerning him, Jan. 4, 1816, says: "Major Gibbs, the naval store-keeper, is an old Revolutionary officer of merit, and has held the station since the commencement of our naval operations. I request your attention and indulgence toward him as far as may be consistent with public duty; and you will be pleased to accommodate him at the Navy Yard with a room for his office, and in every other way in which you can render his situation agreeable to him. A regard for his former services and respect for his personal merit induce me to recommend Major Gibbs to your benevolent disposition."

Major Gibbs was continued in office until Dec. 1, 1818, when George Bates was appointed the storekeeper. He in turn was relieved after twenty-two years of service by Seth J. Thomas, Jan. 1, 1840. Major Gibbs was the first commander of Washington's Body (or "Lite")

In 1818 the Navy Commissioners surveyed the harbor, and reported it capacious and deep enough to be entered by any man-of-war, and that twenty-five and a half feet could be taken over the bar at low tide. They were further of the opinion that Boston harbor possessed many advantages resulting from its natural means of defence, — its ample space for anchorage in the lower harbor and Nantasket Roads, its proximity to materials for naval construction, "and in the dense population of the town and its vicinity;" nevertheless, "from the uncertainty of entrance into it, and that a fair wind was requisite to enter President from Nantasket Roads, and that occasionally it was obstructed by ice, and from the difficulty of getting to sea in easterly weather, and its susceptibility of blockade, and the dangerous navigation of the bay in the winter," — the commissioners did not think it advisable to establish a great national depot and rendezvous at Boston. They, however, recommended retaining the establishment and connecting it with a dry dock for occasional building and repair, and also that the fortifications on George's, Long, Castle, Governor's, and Noddle's islands should be strengthened.

For some years to come there were no signal transactions to notice; but a few items taken from the records may serve to show the course of current events.[1]

In October, 1819, Commodore Bainbridge was ordered to serve as president of a board of captains to convene at New York, to examine midshipmen for promotion. This was an outgrowth of his naval school, and the first examination of midshipmen; the result of which proved so beneficial that now examinations into the physical, moral, and professional qualifications of an officer are made prior to every promotion or increase of rank; and thus the worthy and intelligent are encouraged, and the indolent, ignorant, and profligate driven out of the service. Towards the close of the year the Commodore was detached from the "Independence" and ordered to the "Columbus," 74, then equipping at Washington, when eighteen of the officers of the "Independence" addressed to him a letter of regret.

In 1820, May 16, Master Commandant William Branford Shubrick[2] re-

Guard. His office was first in Batterymarch Street, — the yard at the bottom of Milk Street being leased for naval purposes. When Washington visited Boston in 1789, he appointed eight o'clock, A.M., as the hour when he would leave for Salem. The cavalry company which was to escort him, not understanding his punctuality, paraded in Tremont Street after his departure, and it was not until he had passed Charlestown Bridge that it overtook him. Washington said to Gibbs, who commanded the troop when it overtook him: "I thought, Major Gibbs, you had been too long in my family not to know when it was eight o'clock."

[1] A passing notice may be given to the duel which took place Sept. 25, 1819, between Lieutenant William B. Finch, United States Navy (afterward well known as Commodore William Compton Bolton), and Lieutenant Francis B. White, of the Marine Corps, both officers of the "Independence." It was fought on Noddle's Island, not far from the present Border Street in East Boston, between two elm trees. Lieutenant White was instantly killed. Lieutenant Finch was born in England. His mother was said to have been an actress of the name of Finch; his father, the Earl of Bolton. He entered the navy as a midshipman in 1806; changed his name to William Compton Bolton in 1833 to inherit some property, and died in Genoa while in command of the United States squadron in the Mediterranean, in 1849.

[2] [See Harper's *Monthly*, August, 1876. — ED.]

ported for duty as the executive officer of the Yard; he was the first officer so designated in orders. June 11, the men were all mustered at ten o'clock, A.M., and with all the officers of the station attended divine service in the



sail-loft, the Rev. Cheever Felch officiating. This was the first service of the kind held within the Navy Yard. On June 15 work was discontinued to allow the men to witness the execution of three pirates in Boston.[1]

[1] [See Mr. J. P. Quincy's chapter. — Ed.]

On August 23, 1823, at 1 P.M., Commodore Isaac Hull delivered over the command of the Navy Yard, which he had held for eight years and five months, to Commodore William Bainbridge, who had been his predecessor. A committee of the citizens of Charlestown received Bainbridge at the draw of the bridge and escorted him to the town hall, where a collation was provided. The committee then attended him to the Navy Yard gate, where he was received by Major Wainwright and a guard of marines, who conducted him to Commodore Hull.

In September the commissioners completed the purchase from Dr. Aaron Dexter of a site for a naval hospital in Chelsea, for which $18,000 was paid from the fund in the Treasury which had been deducted from the pay of the officers, seamen, and marines of the navy.[1]

On March 12, 1824, there was a mutiny in the Massachusetts State Prison, which the marines, under Major Wainwright, were called upon to suppress. Three convicts had been sentenced to be publicly whipped in the prison yard, and were in the solitary cells waiting punishment. An officer of the prison entered one of the cells, when the prisoner sprang upon him and locked him in, and then opened the doors of the other two cells. The three prisoners thus released then ordered the officer to give the signal at the guard-room door that all was right, while they stood ready to rush through when the door was opened and secure the guard and arms. The officer refusing to comply with their orders, they threatened to kill him, and he was forced back into a cell and locked in. The alarm having been given, the prisoners rushed from the workshops armed with clubs, knives, hammers, chisels, and every variety of weapon attainable, and formed a band whose strength, vileness, and reckless daring could hardly be equalled. Men of all ages and characters, dressed in the motley garb of the institution, gathered together for the purpose of preventing the punishment of their comrades. Finally a subordinate officer despatched a request to Major Wainwright for assistance. On his arrival Major Wainwright was requested to order his men to fire down upon the convicts through the little

[1] In 1802, by order of the Secretary of the Navy, five acres of land in the north-east corner of the Navy Yard was assigned to the Treasury Department for a Marine Hospital, on which a hospital with all the necessary outbuildings was erected and enclosed with a picket-fence from the Navy Yard. In 1825 this property was re-transferred to the Navy Department, upon the payment to the Treasury Department of $12,875, the estimated value of the buildings, and a Marine Hospital was erected in Chelsea. The hospital building in the yard was pulled down the same year, and on the site was erected a block of four dwelling-houses, which are still occupied as officers' quarters. They were first occupied August, 1826.

The United States Naval Hospital at Chelsea is beautifully situated on the left bank of the Mystic River. It furnishes accommodation for all the sick or wounded officers, seamen, and marines of the navy at Boston, Portsmouth, N. H., and New London, Conn.; and for all the invalids from our naval vessels on foreign stations which may come into the port of Boston. There was originally one hundred and fifteen acres in the tract; there now remain about seventy-five, the remainder having been transferred to the ordnance department of the navy, and to the marines' hospital service. The hospital building is of granite, one hundred and forty-nine feet by seventy-one, and was completed in 1836. A wing was added in 1865. It is capable of accommodating one hundred sick comfortably. The particular merit of this hospital is that it is the only Naval Hospital on the Atlantic coast which is absolutely free from malarial poison.

windows, first with powder, and then with ball, until they surrendered. He took a wiser as well as a bolder course. Relying upon the effect of a firm determination upon men so situated, he ordered the door thrown wide open, and marched into the hall at the head of thirty men, and formed them opposite the crowd of criminals grouped at the other end. He then addressed them, and said he would not quit that hall alive until every convict had returned to his duty. The convicts replied that some of them were ready to die, and only waited his attack, and swore they would fight to the end unless the flogging was remitted. Major Wainwright now ordered his men to load their muskets, and directed each man to hold up to view the bullet which he was to drop into his gun. This only caused a growl of determined resistance on the part of the convicts. The guns being loaded, the next order to the marines was to take aim. Still not a prisoner stirred, except more firmly to grasp his weapon. Major Wainwright then took out his watch, and turning to the convicts, while his men kept their pieces





AUTOGRAPHS OF THE COMMANDANTS.[1]

aimed at them, said: "You must leave this hall. I give you three minutes to decide. If at the end of that time a man remains he shall be shot dead. I speak no more." No more tragic situation than this can be conceived: at one end of the hall a fearless band of desperate and powerful men

[1] In addition to these commandants there were at several times, though not continuously, "port captains," who commanded all the naval forces afloat. Thus Captain William Bainbridge was port captain from 1815 to 1819, — making his service in Boston harbor from 1812 to 1824 almost continuous. Captain John Downes, the commandant from 1835 to 1842, and again from 1849 to 1852, was port captain from 1842 to 1845, — the entire period of the command of his successor as commandant. Rear Admiral Hiram Paulding, a son of one of the captors of Major André, was the port captain in 1869–70. Since that date the office has been abolished.

The twenty-two commandants have had considerable professional reputation. The first commandant, whose command extended over eleven years, died in office in 1811. He saw service during the War of the Revolution, and was the first commander of the frigate "Constitution." Hull and Bainbridge, who alternated in the command for fourteen years, as well as Morris, who commanded for five years, made glorious records in the war of 1812–14. Downes also, whose several commands extended over ten years, commanded the Essex "Junior" in the famous Bay of Valparaiso fight. Elliott was second in command at the battle of Lake Erie. Gregory and J. B. Nicholson made honorable records in the War of 1812. Stringham, whose command extended over seven years, obtained the thanks of Congress for his services at Hatteras Inlet during the Civil War. Commodore Parker, Sr., was selected at one time to organ-

awaiting the assault; at the other, a small squad of well-disciplined marines waiting with levelled muskets the order to fire; the commander counting the tickings of his watch to give the signal. For two minutes not a person or muscle was moved, not a sound heard, except the labored breathing of the infuriated wretches. At the expiration of two minutes, during which they had faced the ministers of death unfalteringly, two or three in the rear went slowly out; a few more followed, dropping out quietly and deliberately, and before the last half minute had expired every man was struck by the panic, and the hall was cleared.

On March 16, 1824, work was begun on the building ways for a sloop-of-war. On the 13th of May her keel was laid, and at 1 P.M., October 15, the sloop-of-war "Boston," of seven hundred tons burden, was launched.[1]

December 22, the Secretary of the Navy ordered the seventy-four which was first begun Oct. 19, 1822, to be named the "Virginia,"[2] and the seventy-four number two the "Vermont," and the forty-four gun ship to be called the "Cumberland." By another order, dated April 27, 1827, the names of the seventy-fours were reversed, number one becoming the "Vermont," and number two the "Virginia." The "Vermont" as thus named was launched in 1853, and is now a receiving hulk at the New York Yard. The "Virginia," after remaining on the stocks for fifty years, was ordered to be cut up in 1874, — an operation which is not yet completed.

June 1, 1826, the keel of the sloop-of-war "Warren" was laid, and November 29 she was successfully launched and hauled upon the flats, and careened to finish coppering her. Feb. 11, 1827, the harbor was shut up with ice, but on the 22d the "Warren," Master Commandant Lawrence Kearney, sailed for the Mediterranean, where she did good service against the pirates of the Grecian Archipelago. March 1, the keel of the sloop-of-war "Falmouth" was laid, and she was launched November 3. Her cost, when ready for sea, was $120,931.50.

In 1827 the stone dry dock was begun, under the superintendence of

ize the navy of the German Confederation; and his son, Commodore Foxhall A. Parker, distinguished as a writer and for his services in the Civil War, died a few months after relinquishing his command, at the Naval Academy at Annapolis, whither he had been called to its superintendency. Hudson and Montgomery, who conducted the affairs of the Yard through the period of the Civil War, were brave and distinguished officers; Hudson was the second in command of Wilkes's exploring expedition. Rodgers is the present superintendent of the Naval Observatory, and has a well-known naval record. Nichols, Parrott, Steedman, Spicer, and Ransom, the present incumbent, all made good records in the Rebellion, — Nichols (now the Chief of the Bureau of Yards and Docks) and Ransom, with Farragut at New Orleans; Parrott and Steedman, with Dupont at Port Royal and elsewhere. Commodore Spicer died in command in the commandant's house, Nov. 29, 1878; his funeral was conducted without military or other parade or ceremony, by his particular request.

Not one of the commandants was Boston born, and only Commodore John Downes, who was born in Canton, in 1784, was a native of Massachusetts. Of the twenty-two commandants only four are now living; namely, Rodgers, Nichols, Steedman, and Ransom, — the latter now in command.

[1] She was the fourth vessel of war to receive that name, and is reported to have cost $109,156. After twenty years of almost constant service, she was wrecked on the Island of Eleuthera, West Indies, in 1846.

[2] From a newspaper of that date we learn that it was at first proposed to call her "The Massachusetts."

Loammi Baldwin, Esq., who had been commissioned in the previous August to make estimates. It appears from the Yard journal that the first "steam tow-boat load of stone" for it was received August 23, and that the stone wall of the dock was begun the next day. The dock was not completed until 1834.

Up to 1828 the improvements in the several navy yards had been without any organized plan; but on March 3, 1827, Congress enacted a law directing the President to cause the navy yards of the United States to be thoroughly examined, and plans to be prepared for their improvement, etc., from which no deviation but by his special order was to be made. The President appointed Commodores Bainbridge, Chauncey, and Morris to carry this law into effect, and Loammi Baldwin engineer to aid them in their surveys, and in forming plans, etc. This board commenced its labors in 1827, but did not complete them until 1829. The plan for the Charlestown Navy Yard was completed and issued Aug. 11, 1828, and (see plan) has since governed all the improvements, with such modifications as have become necessary by the advance of naval science and the modern requirements in the equipment, armament, and construction of vessels of war. Railroads have supplanted canals, and steam power, heavy ordnance, and iron and iron-clad ships have combined to modify essentially the plan of 1827.[1]

July 20, 1832, Commodore Charles Morris, having been commissioned as one of the Navy Board, was relieved as Commandant by Commodore William Bainbridge. Jan. 23, the commissioners authorized the gun carriages of the saluting battery to be made of iron, which is probably the first instance of metallic gun carriages being used in our own or any other naval service.

On account of ill health Commodore Bainbridge obtained permission to pass the winter months in Philadelphia, and left the Yard in command of Master Commandant Joseph Smith.[2] He returned and resumed active command of the station, Jan. 10, 1833, but soon failed again, and was informed by his physicians that his case was hopeless. On March 21 he wrote this touching letter to the secretary: "My health is so bad, and this climate so severe, that it renders it necessary for me to ask the favor to be relieved from my present command on the 1st of May next. In making this request I feel confident our excellent President will grant it, with your approbation, to one who has served his country as commander nearly thirty-five years most zealously, and, as he trusts, most faithfully." He failed rapidly, and on April 13 wrote his last letter to the Department, turning over the command to Captain Smith temporarily, until the arrival of Commodore Jesse Duncan Elliott, appointed to take command on the 1st of May. The death of Commodore Bainbridge, who had been so long and so much identified with the station, took place at the naval asylum in Philadelphia, July 27, 1833. When wandering in mind he raised himself up with a last effort, called for his arms, and ordered all to board the enemy. He was

[1] See plan of 1880. [2] For many years Chief of the Bureau of Yards and Docks.

fifty-nine years, two months, and twenty-one days old. On July 30 the flags at Charlestown Navy Yard, and at all the other naval stations, were half-masted, and a commodore's salute of minute guns fired.

In 1834 the dry dock was finished,[1] having cost $677,089.78, when transferred by the constructing engineer to the commandant.[2]

The new commandant, Commodore Elliott, was a man of rough manners,—whence he obtained the sobriquet of "Old Bruin,"—and of an active and despotic disposition. He at once instituted changes and reforms in the methods of administration, which, added to the reputation he had acquired at the battle of Lake Erie and as the second of Barron in his unfortunate duel with Decatur, made him unpopular with his officers, and were the occasion of several reports and courts-martial. He also, from his extreme partisan worship of his idol — General Jackson — soon became unpopular with the citizens of Boston, who at the time were strongly of the opposite side of politics.

[1] In 1858–60 the dock was lengthened sixty-five feet at the head, modern vessels having outgrown its capacity.

[2] Before the dock was entirely completed it was decided to dock the "Constitution." Accordingly she was admitted June 24, being the second ship of war ever docked in the United States, — the "Delaware," 74, having been entered into the Norfolk Dry Dock on June 17, a week previous. The docking of the "Constitution" was made a great occasion. All the officers were assembled in full dress, and Martin Van Buren, the Vice-President of the United States, Lewis Cass, Secretary of War, and Levi Woodbury were present; and Commodore Hull appeared once more upon her deck in command. The President of the United States, General Andrew Jackson, was only prevented by illness from being present. Commodore Elliott, however, in a speech at Hagerstown, Maryland, Nov. 14, 1833, says that the President *was* on board: "General Jackson became the guest of the State by invitation of the Legislature, and the time of his visit was seized upon as an auspicious season for bringing the trophy of the nation, *Old Ironsides*, into the cradle which was originally built for her reception. On this occasion there were on board of her the President of the United States and his Cabinet, His Excellency the Governor of Massachusetts, my estimable friend Joel N. Poinsett, of South Carolina, and last, not least, Commodore Hull, the man who first broke the charm of British naval invincibility on the ocean, together with such officers and men who had participated in the various battles in which that noble frigate was engaged. Thus you will see that I had four important emblems of the old vessel's glory, — Jackson, the hero who had but a short time before declared that 'the *Constitution!* it must and shall be *preserved!*' the Hon. J. N. Poinsett, of South Carolina, the State in which her timbers grew; the Hon. Levi Lincoln, of the Commonwealth in which she received her architectural construction; and Commodore Hull and the brave officers and men who had gloriously sustained her amid the battle's rage."

The old frigate, when in the dock, presented a most venerable appearance, her bottom being encrusted with mussels, and her ornamental work being all stripped off. She was rebuilt under the superintendence of naval constructor Josiah Barker, and emerged from the dock June 21, 1834, virtually a new ship, having been three days short of a year in it. While care was taken to preserve her model and dimensions, scarcely a timber of her frame above the keel and floor timbers was retained.

[Josiah Barker, who was born in Marshfield, in 1763, had served in the Revolution, both in the army and navy, sailing with Manly in the "Hague," among the West Indies. He had begun a shipyard as early as 1795, where now the Navy Yard is, and later he built vessels near the old State-prison. He built the "Independence," "Virginia," "Vermont," "Frolic," "Marion," "Cyane," and "Bainbridge," and subsequently the "Portsmouth" at the Kittery yard. (Drake's *Landmarks of Middlesex*, 41. H. H. Edes's *Memorial of Josiah Barker*, privately printed, 1871.) It should be remembered that while a Charlestown mechanic rebuilt her, it was a Boston poet who so led and sustained public opinion in a protest against breaking her up, that the order for her destruction was reversed; and this adds another claim for the old craft to be considered peculiarly a Boston ship. The reader will recall Holmes's "Ay, tear her tattered ensign down," and his indignant dread lest "The harpies of the shore shall pluck the eagle of the sea." — Ed].

The day after he had assumed the command he informed the Department that the young gentlemen (midshipmen) were without an instructor, and in consequence Mr. Duncan Bradford was immediately appointed a teacher of mathematics and languages; but the school was not organized until the middle of August. The school proved such a success, that by a general order issued a few months later similar schools were established at the navy yards near Norfolk and New York. This order was followed by a series of regulations, drawn up by the Navy Commissioners, for the government of the midshipmen and the school, which seemed to be the result of measures taken on board the "Independence," in Boston Harbor, in 1815, and out of which has finally come the present naval academy at Annapolis.[1]

The event of Elliott's administration which occasioned the most excitement was his placing a figure of Jackson on the bow of the "Constitution" when she was rebuilt. His intention becoming known, the people very soon manifested symptoms of indignation that the historic frigate should be made to serve what was thought to be a partisan purpose. Commodore Elliott informed the Secretary of the Navy, in a letter dated Feb. 24, 1834, enclosing an obnoxious handbill, that the image was ordered in the summer of 1833, under the following circumstances: —

"Shortly after the President had left Boston, I conversed with the architect (Mr. Barker) who was to superintend the repairs of the 'Constitution,' about the propriety of putting a figure on her for a head, and concluded to do so, as she had been thus ornamented originally.[2] The person who had been in the habit of carving the ornaments for our vessels of war (Laban S. Beecher) was therefore directed to make for her a figure of the President of the United States, dressed as represented at the Hermitage, holding in his hand a scroll with this motto, '*The Constitution, it must be preserved.*' taken from the remarks which you made on her deck at the time she was received into dock, under direction of the officer (Commodore Hull) who commanded her when she took the 'Guerrière.' I furthermore directed him to carve

[1] Having set the midshipmen at their studies, the Commodore next turned his attention to the religious instruction of the officers and men under his command, in which he was not quite so successful. His attempt to coerce the officers of differing beliefs into one and the same manner of worship created a commotion; but of these and other aggressive measures there is no space to speak here.

[2] The original figure-head of the "Constitution" was a bust of Hercules, with uplifted club, carved by the Messrs. Skilling, of Boston. This was shot from her bow and mutilated in the action before Tripoli, but was long worn in its mutilated condition. It was replaced by a billet head, which was worn throughout the war of 1812. Taken from her bow in 1834 this billet head occupied a conspicuous position attached to a lamp post, until 1876, on one of the principal avenues in the Boston Yard. The statue of Jackson remained on the ship until she was hauled up for repair in Philadelphia, in 1874, when it was taken off and set up in the Philadelphia Yard; when that yard was abandoned in 1876, it was sent to the naval academy at Annapolis, Md., and set up in the grounds, where it now is. This full-length figure was much too large for the ship, to be symmetrical. A little boy, criticising the statue when it was in the Philadelphia Yard, said that General Jackson must have been run into his pantaloons, for there was no seam or buttons to them. The billet head of 1812 was sent to Philadelphia to be replaced on the bow of the old ship, but was found to be so decayed that another of like shape was substituted for it, which is now on her. See *Life of Commodore Elliott*, by a citizen of New York, published for the author in Philadelphia, 1835, for a "History of the Figure Head of the United States frigate 'Constitution.'"

the busts of Hull, Bainbridge, and Stewart for her stern ornaments, thus presenting our chief magistrate, and the three successful commanders of that favorite ship, in an attitude which I deemed highly honorable to the navy and the nation. Prompted by my own feelings of respect, . . . and aware of the honors conferred upon General Jackson during his late tour of the State of Massachusetts, and her literary institutions, and more particularly by the inhabitants of Boston and the neighboring towns, I considered that in putting his figure upon the stem of the 'Constitution,' I would be uniting with them in their demonstration of respect, and doing an act which would be acceptable to our whole corps. . . . I have never heard the fitness of the ornament questioned until this week. . . . There is no question this handbill is gotten up for present political purposes; and had the figure-head been put on the frigate at the time of the President's visit, many who now express such intemperate opinions would have been equally zealous in raising it with acclamations to its appropriate place. *I had no political motives whatever in placing the figure there, as politics are not suffered to be the subject of communication or action within the Yard.* I did not bring the subject to you before, as I knew that custom furnished me a precedent, my predecessors having ornamented ships with figures, eagles, and billet heads at their option."[1]

Two days later we find the commodore writing to the secretary:—

"I have further satisfied myself that the excitement got up at that time was only for political effect. The enclosed letter[2] will show the disposition of the raisers of this excitement. . . . If the figure-head of the 'Constitution' should be changed to please them, there is no telling what they will ask next, as they now demand the removal of the inscription from the head of the dry dock. The excitement has nearly passed away since it has become known that the figure-head was ordered by myself six months ago, unbeknown to the Government, yet *fully known* to one of the most active movers in the excitement."

The Navy Commissioners wrote to the commodore in answer that he might carry out his intentions regarding the figure-head, or place it on the

[1] The handbill referred to by the Commodore was as follows:—

"FREEMEN, AWAKE! *or the Constitution will sink.* It is a fact that 'the Old Glory* President' has issued his special order for a colossal figure of his *royal self*, in Roman costume, to be placed as a figure-head on Old Ironsides!!! Where is the spirit of '76? where the brave *tars* who fought and conquered in the glorious ship? where the mechanics, and where the Bostonians, who have rejoiced over her achievements? Will they see the figure of a land lubber at her bows? No! let the cry be, 'All hands on deck!' and save the ship by a timely remonstrance, expressing our indignation in a voice of thunder! Let us assemble in the cradle of liberty! all hands up for the Constitution. Let the figure-head (if mortal man be worthy) be that of the brave HULL, the immortal DECATUR, or the valiant PORTER, and not that of a tyrant. Let us not give up the ship, but nail the flag of the Union to the masthead, and let her ride the mountain wave triumphant, with none aboard but the sons of liberty, all flesh and blood, having the hearts and souls of Freemen.

"North Enders! shall this Boston-built ship be thus disgraced without remonstrance? Let this wooden god, this old Roman, building at the expense of $300 of the people's money, be presented to the *office-holders*, who glory in such worship; but for God's sake SAVE THE SHIP from this foul disgrace!

"A NORTH ENDER."

* Is not this the earliest allusion to "Old Glory," a name so often associated during the war of the Rebellion with our flag, by its defenders?

[2] NORTH END, 24th.

We have made you abandon the Constitution; take Jackson's name off the Dock, or in forty-eight hours you breathe no more.

MANY NORTH ENDERS.

Commodore Elliott, Navy Yard.

bow of one of the seventy-fours building, as he saw fit, believing the latter most appropriate; but the busts of the naval heroes for the stern, if not too far advanced, might be dispensed with.[1]

On March 20, the carver informed the commodore that three respectable citizens had offered him $1,500 to be allowed to carry away the image in the night, and added he could, if disposed, realize $20,000 for it; and further, so great was the excitement, "the head" was not safe in his shop.[2] In consequence the commodore sent a boat the next morning in charge of Sailing-Master Hixon, who received the figure in a box and conveyed it to the Navy Yard, where it was completed, and placed, April 28, upon the ship while still in the dock.

Of what happened after the ship left the dock, and was hauled into the stream, the commodore makes report: —

"Some one last night, in spite of the sentinel and watch on board the 'Columbus,' seventy-four, found means to mutilate the statue of Jackson upon the bow of the 'Constitution,' during a severe storm of wind and rain. Suspicion at first rested upon the marine on post and the ship keeper; but it seems to me at present more probable that some person from outside the yard concealed himself on board ship during the day, and at night when the storm raged at its highest accomplished his work and made his escape. Immediately upon learning the outrage this morning, I sent for the carver of the head and demanded the names of the individuals who offered him the bribe previous to its removal from his charge. These he declined giving me until compelled to do so in due course of law, as he was under a charge of secrecy. From this and other circumstances I am satisfied that the head was removed by some person who was acting under the influence of a bribe; but a small part of the head, however, was mutilated, and that part will be replaced immediately. I am sorry to say that I perceive a hostile feeling existing against the continuance of this ornament in the highest circles of those opposed to the Administration." [3]

It is now known that the daring deed was committed by one unaided, enthusiastic young man, — Samuel P. Dewey, — who I believe still lives, in hale old age, to repeat the story, and to tell what he did with the trophy of his exploit. His story, as he gave it to Mr. Drake,[4] in 1874, is as follows:

[1] The busts, however, were made, and did until recently, and I believe do still, ornament her stern.

[2] In an address at Hagerstown, Md., in 1843, Commodore Elliott said he received orders to repair the ship "as she originally was;" and the impression being still upon his mind of her mutilated figure of Hercules when in the Mediterranean, he proceeded to have a figure made of that classic hero, and the artist was at work upon it when he (the commodore) was frequently and earnestly importuned by prominent citizens of Boston to place the head of Jackson upon their favorite ship. Yielding to their solicitations, he asked the artist if he could change the head to a likeness of Jackson, and the artist was so delighted with the idea that he proposed doing it for nothing. The plaster bust which the carver took as his model for the head, is preserved in the Museum of the Naval Library and Institute at the Navy Yard.

[3] The Hon. Mahlon Dickenson, who had succeeded the Hon. Levi Woodbury as Secretary of the Navy, visiting the Yard soon after this occurrence, in company with the Commissioners, ordered the canvas covering over the mutilated head continued upon it, saying no repairs or alterations should be made while the ship remained in Boston. Several of the "solid" merchants of Boston gave Commodore Elliott to understand that if he would remove the obnoxious figure from the ship, any substitute he might order would be paid for by them

[4] *Landmarks of Old Middlesex*, p. 41.

"'Old Ironsides' was moored with her head to the west, between the 74's 'Columbus' and 'Independence.' The former had a large number of men on board, and a sentinel was placed where he could keep the figurehead in view; another was posted on the wharf near at hand, and a third patrolled the forecastle of the 'Constitution.' From an open port of the 'Columbus,' the light fell upon the graven features all these precautions were designed to protect. On the night of the 2d of July occurred a thunder-storm of unusual violence. The lightning played around the masts of the shipping, and only by its lurid flash could any object be distinguished in the blackness. Young Dewey — he was only twenty-eight — unmoored his boat from Billy Gray's wharf, in Boston, and, with his oar muffled in an old woollen comforter, sculled out into the darkness. He had reconnoitered the position of the ships by day, and was prepared at all points. At length he found himself alongside the 'Independence,' the outside ship, and worked his way along her big, black side, which served to screen him from observation. Dewey climbed up the 'Constitution's' side by the man-ropes, and ensconced himself in the bow, protected by the head-boards, only placed on the ship the same day. He extended himself on his back, and in this position sawed off the head. While here he saw the sentry on the wharf from time to time looking earnestly towards the spot where he was at work; but the lightning and the storm each time drove the guard back to the shelter of his box.

"Having completed his midnight assassination, Dewey regained his boat, to find her full of water. She had swung under a scupper of the ship, and had received the torrent that poured from her deck. In this plight, but never forgetting the head he had risked his life to obtain, Dewey reached the shore. . . . After the excitement caused by the affair — and it was of no ordinary kind — had subsided, Dewey packed up the grim and corrugated features he had decapitated, and posted off to Washington. At Philadelphia his secret leaked out, and he was obliged to exhibit his prize to John Tyler and Willie P. Mangum, afterward President and acting Vice-President of the United States, who were then investigating the affairs of the United States Bank. These grave and reverend seigniors shook their sides as they regarded the colossal head now brought so low, and parted with Captain Dewey with warm and pressing offers of service.

"The Captain's intention to present the head to General Jackson himself was frustrated by the dangerous illness of the President, to whom all access was denied. He, however, obtained an audience of Mr. Van Buren, the Vice-President. Upon Dewey's announcing himself as the person who had taken off the 'Constitution's' figure-head, Mr. Van Buren gave a great start, and was thrown off his usual balance. Recovering himself, he demanded the particulars of the exploit, which seemed to afford him no small satisfaction. Captain Dewey wished him to receive the head. 'Go to Mr. Dickenson,' said the Vice-President; 'it belongs to his department; say you came from me.' To Mahlon Dickenson, Secretary of the Navy, Dewey accordingly went. The venerable secretary was busily engaged with a heap of papers, and requested his visitor to be brief. This hint was not lost on the captain, who said: 'Mr. Dickenson, I am the person who removed the figure-head from the "Constitution," and I have brought it with me for the purpose of returning it to the Government.' The secretary threw himself back in his chair, pushed his gold-bowed spectacles with a sudden movement up on his forehead, and regarded with genuine astonishment the man who, after evading the most diligent search for his discovery,

now came forward and made this voluntary avowal. Between amazement and choler, the old gentleman could scarce stutter out: 'You, sir! You! What, sir! Did you have the audacity to disfigure a ship of the United States Navy?' — 'Sir, I took the responsibility. — 'Well, sir, I'll have you arrested immediately;' and the secretary took up the bell to summon a messenger. 'Stop, sir!' said the captain, 'You cannot inflict any punishment. I can only be sued for a trespass, and in the county where the offence was committed. Say the word, and I will go back to Charlestown, and await my trial; but if a Middlesex jury don't give *me* damages, my name is not Dewey.' The captain had explored the ground, and there was no statute at that time against defacing ships of war, and he knew it. Mr. Dickenson, an able lawyer, reflected a moment, and then put down his bell. 'You are right, sir,' said he; 'and now tell me all about the affair.' The captain remained some time closeted with the secretary, of whose treatment he had no reason to complain."[1]

Commodore Elliott sailed in the "Constitution" on the 3d of March for New York, and so concluded his stormy command of the Boston Yard. His successor, Commodore John Downes, assumed charge on the 16th of March. Commodore Downes continued the commandant for seven years and three months, until May 31, 1842, — a longer continuous command of the station than has ever been held by any one, except the first *Superintendent*, Commodore Samuel Nicholson, whose command extended from 1800 to 1812. Commodore Downes was also the commandant from March, 1849, to May, 1852, another period of three years; so that his administrations cover a greater time than any other commandant's before or since.

The "Independence," 74, the second vessel that was docked, having been razeed to a fine frigate,[2] took on board the United States Minister

[1] A nephew of Mr. Dewey, in a communication to the *Boston Evening Transcript*, Feb. 16, 1875, confirmed Mr. Drake's account, and added: "The morning after the figure-head was gone, all Boston was in commotion, and Sam Dewey was missing. The boots he wore the day before were hanging on a line in the back-yard, and his mother, having a strong suspicion that *she* knew who did the deed, confirmed the same by touching her tongue to the boots, and ascertained that they had been wet by salt water."

After the deed, Commodore Elliott posted a marine sentinel, with an officer constantly by his side at night, to defend the figurehead from further mutilation; and Commodore E. reported to the Secretary of the Navy "that on the 5th of July [he was probably mistaken] a second attempt was made to carry off a larger portion of the figure, which was discovered, one of the actors being probably drowned in attempting to escape, while the other succeeded in passing the wall. The boat [he adds] in which the attempt was made was captured, and is now at the yard." The excitement, and how far it extended, may be realized by stating the fact that when the news of the mutilation of the figure was received in Wheeling, Va., the bells were rung, and the people, in a public meeting, passed resolutions approving the act.

The "Constitution" finally sailed from Boston for New York with its mutilated figure of Jackson on her bow covered with canvas, painted to represent the American flag. At New York the head was replaced; and, in order to secure it against similar assaults, a copper bolt was driven perpendicularly through it into the body of the figure.

[2] "The 'Independence,'" says the *Boston Post* of that day, "is now one of the most elegantly-modelled, commodious, and efficient ships in the navy. She has a battery of sixty 32-pounders, thirty long guns on her main-deck, and an equal number of medium guns on her spar-deck. She is pierced for sixty-four guns, and her stern ports may in an exigency be converted into a battery, by changing the position of the aft and bow guns. The aggregate weight of the guns on the main-deck is 1,767 cwt, and on the spar-deck, 1,505 cwt. Her length, 200 feet; beam, 52; depth from spar-deck to hold, 30; depth between the beams and main-deck, 6 ft. 1 inch, an amount of space

to Russia, Hon. George M. Dallas and suite, and May 20, 1837, sailed, under the command of Commodore John B. Nicholson, from Boston.

There can be no doubt that the change made this ship the finest and heaviest frigate-built vessel of her time. On her arrival at Portsmouth, England, she was visited by the chief naval authorities, who expressed their admiration of her fine proportions and size; and the Admiralty soon after issued orders to lay down vessels of like character and capacity, and to razee several ships of the line to vessels of the same class.[1]

Another historic vessel was launched from the Yard when, on May 24, 1842, the frigate "Cumberland" slid from her ways.[2] She was a fine frigate of one thousand seven hundred and twenty-six tons, rated as a forty-four, but mounting sixty guns, and was built at a cost of $357,475. She served two cruises in the Mediterranean as Commodore S. H. Stringham's and Commodore Joseph Smith's flag-ship, and in 1846 as Commodore D. Connor's flag-ship in the Gulf of Mexico, and saw other service. She was afterward razeed into a decked sloop-of-war, or corvette, mounting twenty-two heavy guns, and was finally sunk by the rebel ironclad "Virginia" (Merrimac), in the memorable conflict in Hampton Roads, March, 1862.[3]

On Oct. 29, 1852, the United States steamer "Princeton No. 2" was launched. It is interesting to note that she was the successor of "Princeton No. 1," broken up in the Yard, and was built to contain her engines. The first "Princeton" was not only the first screw steamship added to our navy, but was also the first man-of-war screw steamship in the world.

Mention should be made of still another famous craft. On July 11, 1854, the keel was laid of a steam frigate, which was named the "Merrimac;" she was launched June 14, 1855, in the presence of many thousands of spectators, and towed to the upper shears to be masted. The National Lancers, of Boston, were present, and a salute of thirty-one guns was fired. The "Ohio," 74, and "Vermont," 74, in the stream, were thronged with people. She was modelled by Chief-Constructor John Lenthall, and built under the superintendence of Naval Constructor Edward H. Delano. She was of three thousand two hundred tons burden, was built to carry forty heavy guns, and cost complete $879,126.

which will be of the greatest utility during an engagement. Mainmast, 115 feet, and main-yard 105, and the same suit of sails she carried when a 74. Her draft at present is 22 feet 5 inches; and she carries 600 men, including the marines. She is probably the finest ship of her class in the world."

[1] On her arrival in Russia, she was visited incognito by the Emperor Nicholas; while he was inspecting the ship, the character of the royal visitor was discovered, when the imperial standard was hoisted at her main and a national salute fired, — a signal for all the surrounding ships of the Russian navy to hoist the Imperial standard, and to thunder out salutes of welcome.

[2] Her keel had been laid Oct. 29, 1825.

[3] Her fate has been immortalized in Longfellow's ballad of *The Cumberland:* —

. . . . . .

"Then like a kraken huge and black,
She crushed our ribs in her iron grasp!
Down went the 'Cumberland' all a-wrack,
With a sudden shudder of death,
And the cannon's breath
For her dying gasp.

"Next morn, as the sun rose over the bay,
Still floated our flag at the mainmast head.
Lord, how beautiful was Thy day!
Every waft of the air
Was a whisper of prayer
Or a dirge for the dead."

She sailed from Boston on her trial trip Feb. 25, 1856, and, returning, sailed again for Annapolis, where she arrived on April 19. She was the first screw steam-frigate launched in our navy, and while at Annapolis was visited and admired by great numbers, including nearly all the members of both Houses of Congress, then assembled in Washington. May 6, 1856, she sailed for Havana, and, returning to Boston July 7 following, sailed for England September 9 of the same year, and returned to Norfolk, Va., *via* St. Thomas, W. I., March 15, 1857. While in England she was visited by the naval authorities at Portsmouth, who pronounced her to be the finest vessel of war of her class afloat at that time; and the Admiralty at once issued orders to lay down several steam-frigates, patterned after her. From Norfolk she returned to Boston, and was immediately equipped for sea, and sailed Oct. 17, 1857, for the Pacific, bearing the broad pennant of Commodore John Collins Long. Returning from the Pacific, she arrived at Norfolk Feb. 6, 1860, and was put in ordinary. This was her last service under our flag. In April, 1861, she was got ready for sea, and but for the prevalence of treasonable counsels would have been taken out of Norfolk before the destruction of the navy yard, April 21, 1861. Her conversion into an ironclad, and, under the name of "Virginia," her attack upon our ships in Hampton Roads, and her defeat by the little "Monitor," March 8, 1862, and destruction by the rebels, May 11, 1862, have become matters of history.[1]

Jan. 1, 1858, the keel of a new steamship was laid in the upper ship-house. This ship, now known as the favorite flag-ship of Admiral Farragut, — the historic "Hartford," — was launched at 11.18 A. M., November 22, having been ten months and twenty-two days on the stocks.[2]

[1] Rear-Admiral Charles H. Davis wrote a history of the "Merrimac," which was printed in the *N. E. Hist. and Geneal. Reg.*, July, 1874.

[2] From a newspaper account we condense the following report of the launch of this since famous ship: —

"The weather was propitious, the mildness of a summer day succeeding an eager and nipping air, as the sun rose to the meridian; the tide was unusually high, — the highest of the year. As the hour for the launch approached, a continuous stream of visitors came pouring into the Yard. Hundreds were accommodated in the long galleries of the great ship-house, many betook themselves to the pier at the east side of it, and hundreds more took up positions along the sea-wall to the west of the ship. Many of the officers of the navy, and a large number of ladies and gentlemen, went on board and were launched in her. A large platform, temporarily erected, on the west side of the ship-house was filled with people, as were the tops of all the small buildings overlooking the scene. A line of scows was placed from the wharf to the 'Vermont' (74 guns), which was converted into a reception place for guests; and the Navy-Yard band, stationed on board, contributed to the interest of the occasion. The flag-ship 'Ohio' (74) was also gaily decorated with flags fore and aft. At half-past nine several hundred workmen were disposed along the ways, and with battering rams, each managed by four men, the work of setting up the wedges was commenced. The dull and irregular sound of wood meeting wood was succeeded by the busy clinking of the top-mauls against the iron wedges, splitting out the blocks upon which the keel rested, the wale and bilge shores having been previously removed. The blocks were cut out, and now the ship was held stationary on the long inclined plane by means of a thick oak plank on either side, one end of which was secured to the bilge-ways which went out from the ship, while the other was bolted firmly to the immovable launching ways. A double jack-screw was placed under the bow of the ship, by which to give her a start on her entrance into the watery element. The multitude of visitors momentarily increased. The harbor presented an animated appearance, dotted all around with the cutters of the navy, manned by gallant tars, the

The ship as launched rated fourteen heavy guns, but mounted twenty-two when equipped for sea, and measured one thousand nine hundred and twenty tons; under later laws her measurement was reduced to one thousand three hundred and sixty-six tons, and was increased again, by the addition of a spar-deck in 1870, to two thousand tons, and two thousand nine hundred tons displacement. Her first cruise — 1859–61 — was to the East Indies, as the flag-ship of Commodore Stribling. Returning thence, she was the flag-ship of Farragut at New Orleans and at Mobile. After the war she was sent to the East Indies as the flag-ship of Rear-Admiral H. H. Bell, who had been Farragut's chief of staff at New Orleans. Admiral Bell was drowned at Hiogo, Japan, while she was wearing his flag. On her return to New York, a spar-deck, as noted, was added, and she was almost rebuilt. She is now (1881) in the dry-dock, at the Navy Yard, Charlestown, undergoing extensive repairs. It is worthy of remark, that she was launched from the same ways as the "Merrimac." [1]

barge or long gig of some superior officer, and numerous yawl-boats from vessels in port. Here and there a squad of marines stood, interested spectators of the scene, and quite a number of the uniforms of the Boston police were to be seen among the crowd. Some bad boys delighted to astonish the multitude by shouting in an ecstasy of mirth and with roguish winks, 'There she goes!' each time raising the expectation of the bystanders, to be succeeded by looks of blank astonishment at the presumption of Young America. At length the sound of hammers ceased, the form of Mr. Delano, the constructor, appeared conspicuously at the forward part of the ship, and the order was given to saw off the planks that alone restrained her freedom. The plates of the saws had gone nearly through the planks, when the ship, impatient to leave *terra firma*, broke the remaining hindrance, and glided down the ways into the water, amid the shouts of the spectators, who first said cautiously, 'She moves!' then, as doubt gave way to certainty, a confident burst of '*There she goes!*' announced the success of the launch. The workmen cheered the ship, and those on board returned the compliment; the band struck up 'Hail Columbia,' and the battery on the sea-wall thundered a salute of thirty-two guns,— one for every State in the Union, — and amid loud cheers and the waving of handkerchiefs the good ship gracefully settled down upon the tide. As she touched the water, Miss Lizzie Stringham, daughter of the Commandant of the Yard, broke a bottle of Connecticut-River water across her figurehead; Miss Carrie Downes, daughter of Commodore Downes, a bottle of Hartford spring-water; and Lieutenant George H. Preble, a bottle of sea water, obtained from outside the harbor, — and thus was she nobly christened THE HARTFORD. The ship floated out into the harbor about three times her length from the pier, when she was checked by the cables, and her stern swung toward Chelsea, when the tugs 'Huron' and 'Wide Awake' steamed alongside and towed her to the wharf. Not the slightest accident occurred to mar the gala occasion. Hundreds came late, to find the vessel had gone off, and that 'time and tide wait for no man,' — or woman."

I may add to the account of the christening, that unfortunately one of the young ladies broke the bottle of water assigned her before the launch, and the other, in the excitement, threw hers wide of the mark, and it entered the water unbroken; so that the only bottle fairly broken upon her bows was a bottle of sea water, held by the writer, as he pronounced her, in loud voice, "The *good ship* HARTFORD." Commodore Stringham, consistently with his known temperance proclivities, would not allow the heathen custom of breaking a bottle of wine over the bows, as a libation to the gods Neptune and Bacchus.

[1] Prior to the war of 1861–65, the following vessels of war had been launched from the Navy Yard; namely, the "Frolic," sloop-of-war, 1813; "Independence," 74, 1814; "Alligator," schooner, 1820; "Boston," sloop-of-war, 1825; "Warren," sloop-of-war, 1826; "Falmouth," sloop-of-war, 1827; brig "Boxer," 1831; brig "Porpoise," and barques "Consort" and "Pioneer," 1836; "Marion," sloop-of-war, 1837; "Cyane," sloop-of-war, 1839; brig "Bainbridge," 1842; "Erie," rebuilt, 1842; "Cumberland," frigate, 1842; "Plymouth," sloop-of-war, 1843; "Vermont," 74 (launched), 1848; "Princeton," S.S., 1851; "Merrimac," screw-frigate, 1855 (afterward the historic Confederate iron-clad, "Virginia"); "Hartford," screw-sloop, 1858; "Narragansett," screw-sloop, 1859.

Between 1861 and 1866 the Civil War caused great activity in the building, equipping, and movement of vessels. During these years thirty-nine vessels of war were built at the Navy Yard, and in the neighboring shipyards of Boston;[1] and forty-three purchased vessels were equipped at the Navy Yard.

When, on March 5, 1874, the iron torpedo-boat "Intrepid" was launched from the upper ship-house, at 1.15 P. M., she was the first vessel of the kind added to our navy.

Between the years 1832 and 1880, inclusive, — a period of forty-eight years, — there was expended upon the establishment at Charlestown, including the civil establishment, improvements, outlays for the magazine and hospital, and contingent expenses and general maintenance, $10,618,716, — an average annual expenditure of $221,223.62. This does not include the expenditures on the ships built and repaired at the Yard during that period, or the pay of laborers and mechanics employed on them.

There are now, in 1881, on the stocks at the Navy Yard (besides what is left of the "Virginia"), the "Connecticut," a first-rate, of two thousand eight hundred and sixty-nine tons, and four thousand four hundred and forty-two tons displacement, whose keel was laid in 1864; the "Oregon," a double-turreted ironclad, whose keel was laid in 1864; and the "Penn-

[1] The following vessels were built: "Wachusett," 1861; "Housatonic," 1861; "Maritanza," 1861; "Huron," 1861; "Chocura," 1861; "Marblehead," 1861; "Sagamore," 1861; "Canandaigua," 1862; "Genessee," 1862; "Tioga," 1862; "Massasoit," 1863; "Osceola," 1863; "Mattabahassett," 1863; "Chicopee," 1863; "Tallapoosa," 1863; "Winooski," 1863; "Pequot," 1863; "Saco," 1863; "Monadnock," 1864; "Winnepec," 1864; "Ammonoosuc," 1864; "Ashuelot," 1865; "Speedwell," 1865; "Fortune," 1865; "Guerrière," 1865; "Leyden," 1866; "Palos," 1866; "Standish," 1866; "Mayflower," 1866; "Worcester" or "Maniton," 1866. Ironclads, — "Nantucket," 1863; "Nahant," 1863; "Canonicus," 1864; "Casco," 1864; "Chimo," 1864; "Shawnee," 1864; "Nausett," 1865; "Squando," 1865; "Suncook," 1865. The "Guerrière," in 1871, took the remains of Admiral Farragut from Portsmouth to New York; and in 1873 brought the remains of Major-General Robert Anderson, of Fort Sumter fame, from Nice to the same port. The "Monadnock," a double-turreted ironclad, was the first monitor ironclad to go from the Atlantic to the Pacific Ocean, in 1866.

The following vessels were purchased for the United States, and equipped at the Navy Yard, during the war: —

1861. — "P. Sprague," S.S., 963 tons, name changed to "Flag;" "Cambridge," S.S., 858 tons; "Ethan Allen," sailing bark, 566 tons; "Fear-not," sailing ship, 1,012 tons; "Gemsbok," sailing bark, 620 tons; "Ino," sailing ship, 985 tons; "Massachusetts," S.S., 1,115 tons; "South Carolina," S.S., 1,165 tons; "Onward," sailing bark, 874 tons; "W. G. Anderson," sailing bark, 542 tons; "Young Rover," sailing bark, 418 tons.

1862. — "Kensington," S.S., 1,052 tons.

1863. — "Aries," prize S.S., 820 tons; "Britannia," prize S.S., 495 tons; "Cornubia," prize S.S., 800 tons; "Dow," prize S.S., 390 tons; "Harvest Moon," S. W. Str., 546 tons; "Howgush," 397 tons; "Iron Age," S.S., 424 tons; "Niphon," S.S., 475 tons; "Kershaw," prize S.S., 80 tons; "Sunflower," steam-tug, 294 tons; "Vicksburg," changed to "Acacia," S.S., 500 tons; "Victory," changed to "Queen," prize S.S., 630 tons; "Wando," prize S.S., 645 tons.

1864. — "Atlanta," prize S.S. ironclad, 1,006 tons; "Azalia," steam-tug, 176 tons; "Bat," prize S.S., 530 tons; "Belle," 52 tons; "Cherokee," prize S.S., 606 tons; "F.W. Lincoln," name changed to "Phlox," Str., 317 tons; "Glide," steam-tug, name changed to "Glance," 80 tons; "Little Ada," prize S.S., 196 tons; "Philippi," prize S.S., 311 tons; "Thistle," prize S.S., name changed to "Dumbarton;" "Union," name changed to "Unit," S.S., 500 tons; "Tristram Shandy," prize S.S., 444 tons.

1865. — "Ella and Annie," prize S.S., 627 tons, name changed to "Malvern;" "R. E. Lee," prize S.S., 900 tons, name changed to "Fort Donaldson;" "Trefoil," steam-tug, 370 tons; "Young America," prize, 173 tons; "Yucca," S.S., 373 tons.


Salem Turnpike
Rope Walk
Chelsea Street
Navy Yard
Boston Navy Yard
Timber Shed
Timber Shed
Timber Shed
Timber Shed
Mould Loft
Timber Dock
Store House
Store House
Store House
Ordnance Store & Shops
Joiner Shops
Rolling Mills
Saw Mill
Store House
Boiler House
Ship House
Ship House
Dry Dock
Old Navy Store
Coal Shed
Coal Shed
Gun Park
Shot Park
Barn
Railroad
Plan of
U.S. NAVY YARD, BOSTON MASS.
1874.
Scale of Feet
Note —
Figures indicate soundings in feet at mean low water.

sylvania," whose keel was laid in 1865. It is not probable that any of these vessels will be launched or put to any practical use as war vessels, being behind the times as to model and design, and much decayed. It will be more economical to build new ships.

The "Niagara" and "Iowa," first rates, "Ossipee,"[1] third rate, and "Ohio," 74, are in ordinary at the Yard. They are not likely to be called into active service again, as they are decayed, and more or less of an obsolete type. The steam-frigate "Wabash" lies off the Yard, in commission as the receiving ship for recruits; and the "Hartford," as has been stated, is in the dry-dock undergoing extensive repairs, which will be completed in 1882.

The Navy Yard, which was originally little more than an unpromising mud flat, with additional purchases since made, and the filling-in of flats and marshes, now contains an area of eighty-seven and a half acres.[2]



[1] The "Ossipee" was towed to Philadelphia in May, 1881, by the "Vandalia," to be rebuilt.

[2] It is surrounded on the land side by a substantial granite wall, twelve feet high, built in 1825–26, and has a water-frontage of eight thousand two hundred and seventy feet; it has three building-slips and four ship-houses: in all seven building-ways for vessels. There is a wet-timber dock at the eastern end of the yard, enclosing an area of over five acres. In the upper part of the Yard are two wet basins, only separated by a roadway, and covering an area of seven acres. It has been proposed to excavate these basins, to afford dockage for the ships in ordinary. There are now (1881) inside the walls twenty brick, eleven stone, thirty-six wooden, and two iron buildings, besides numerous temporary sheds and buildings. Only eight buildings are standing which are on the yard plan of 1823. The oldest, at the entrance of the Yard, was built of brick in 1803, for a storehouse, sail-loft, and offices, etc., and is now occupied by the library and museum of the United States Naval Library and Institute, and for court-martial room, dispensary, pay, and other offices. The dwelling-house for the commandant was not completed until 1809, and has been occupied by the first and every successive commandant. Its interior has undergone many alterations and changes; but its exterior presents much the appearance of the original plan. There are two avenues running lengthwise of the Yard, ornamented with shade-trees; and "Flirtation Alley," along the inner side of the ropewalk, with its shady trees and plank-walk, is a well-known resort of lovers on moonlight nights. There are four dwellings for officers at the eastern and five at the western entrance of the Yard. The commandant's house and the marine barracks, with the marine officers' quarters, occupy a midway position in the Yard.

The steam-engineering building, erected in 1858, is of brick, with granite trimmings. It covers an area of one hundred and thirty-five thousand seven hundred and fifty-five square feet, and contains a brass and iron foundry, boiler, blacksmith, and machine shops; there are two engines of one hundred horse-power in the building, to drive the machinery of the establishment; and the chimney is higher than Bunker Hill Monument, being two hundred and forty feet in height, while the monument is two hundred and twenty feet. The rolling-mill connected is a brick building, two hundred and seven by eighty-eight feet, and has an engine of one hundred horse-power.

The ropewalk, the finest in the country, was built in 1836, of rough ashlar granite, and runs parallel with Chelsea Street for *one thousand three hundred and sixty feet*. A second story, seven hundred and forty-eight feet long, was built in 1856. The head house is of three stories, sixty by seventy feet, and contains two double engines, — the needed power for the

manufactory. It can manufacture two thousand five hundred tons per year of all kinds and sizes of rope. All the rope used by the United States navy is manufactured at this establishment. A two-story brick building, to the eastward in line with the wall, in 1873 was arranged for the manufacture of wire rope, and is capable of turning out five hundred tons of wire rigging. There is a brick boiler-house, fifty-five by forty-four feet, containing eight boilers, supplying the requisite power for the use of the establishments; and a granite hemp-house, for the storage of that material; also a tarring-house. The machinery is almost automatic, and very interesting and curious, and in wonderful contrast to that of former years.

CHAPTER VI.

THE ANTISLAVERY MOVEMENT IN BOSTON.

BY JAMES FREEMAN CLARKE.

THE emancipation of four millions of slaves in the United States was certainly one of the greatest events of the nineteenth century. If finally accomplished by the sword, the power which wielded the sword was the conscience and reason of the nation, awakened to the sight of this great evil and sin. To create the moral force which overthrew slavery was the work of the Abolitionists; and they accomplished this work in about thirty years, or in the life of a single generation. When we consider the resistance which was overcome, this result must be regarded as an unexampled triumph of pure truth. The slaves held in the Southern States were valued, at the time of the Civil War, at about three thousand millions of dollars. Added to this pecuniary interest was the value of cotton lands, sugar plantations, and rice fields, cultivated exclusively by slaves. Besides this powerful motive for maintaining slavery were the force of custom, the habits engendered by despotism, pride, prejudice, and hatred of outside interference. These interests and feelings gradually united the whole South in a determined hostility to emancipation; and men professing Antislavery principles could not live safely in many of the slaveholding States. This united South had for its allies at the North both the great political parties, the commercial and manufacturing interests, nearly the whole press, and both extremes of society. Abolition was equally obnoxious in the parlors of the wealthy and to the crowd of roughs in the streets, — fashion and the mob being for once united by a common enmity. It was against this immense weight of opposition that the Abolitionists contended; and their strength consisted wholly in the justice of their cause, and the enthusiasm which that cause inspired. They could appeal to no personal interests or partialities. Their client, the colored man, was unattractive, ignorant, without influence, and could make them no return for their generous labors. They must "give, hoping for nothing again." In this cause they must be prepared to sacrifice the dearest friendships, social position, opportunity of advancement, — and with scarcely any reasonable prospect of ultimate success. Unless they could trust in the immortal power of justice and truth, they

had little ground for hope. But they did so trust, and their faith was rewarded with sight. Many lived to see the triumph of their cause, and in their case was realized the saying that "those who go forth weeping, bearing good seed, shall doubtless come again rejoicing, bringing their sheaves with them."

It is therefore no small honor to the city of Boston that it was the cradle in which this new Revolution was rocked, and the nursery where it grew into strength. It was not so considered at first. For a long time the presence of the Abolitionists and their meetings were regarded by the large majority of Bostonians as a misfortune; but we can now see that a community which furnished the proper soil in which such a plant could grow must have possessed a strong moral character.

It was not accident which made Boston the cradle of the Abolition movement, any more than it was accident which made it, sixty years before, the cradle of the American Revolution. A habit of independent thought, and a vigorous moral training, supplied the conditions necessary for both.

Before the Revolution, Massachusetts, like all the other States, held slaves. Those of my age can remember seeing in many households old colored men and women who, though they had become free, remained in the families where they had been born slaves. In the Congressional report of Mr. J. R. Ingersoll, in 1844, on Antislavery resolutions passed by Massachusetts, the State is taunted with advertisements from Boston newspapers of 1776, offering slaves for sale in that town. The very number of the *Boston Gazette*, July 22, 1776, which contained the Declaration of Independence, advertised a stout, healthy negro-man for sale. Down to that time slavery continued, though in a mild form, in our State. The number of slaves was not large. In 1763 the number of blacks to whites was as one to forty-five; in 1776, as one to sixty-five.[1] They were not badly treated. Slaves in Massachusetts were always allowed to testify against white men, even in capital cases.[2] No woman was ever known to labor as a field-hand in this State. The sentiment of the people was strong against slavery, even in early days. In 1646 the General Court passed an order sending back to Africa a negro stolen there and brought to Boston, expressing its indignation against man-stealing. In 1701 the Selectmen of Boston passed a vote requesting the Representatives "to put a period to negroes being slaves." In 1766 and 1767 votes were passed in town-meeting instructing its representatives "THAT for the total abolishing of slavery among us, THAT you move for a law to prohibit the importation and purchasing of slaves for the future."[3] In 1770 occurred the case of Prince Boston, who was hired and paid wages by a Quaker in Nantucket, — Elisha Folger; and when his owner brought an action for the recovery of his slave, the jury returned a verdict against the owner, and

[1] *Report to Massachusetts House of Representatives*, January, 1822, by Theodore Lyman, Jr., afterward Mayor of Boston.

[2] *Lecture at Lowell Institute*, by Emory Washburn, 1869.

[3] Theodore Lyman, Jr.'s *Report*, as above.

Prince Boston was manumitted by the magistrates. The feeling of those Bostonians who desired independence was expressed by Sam Adams, who, when a negro girl was offered as a present to his wife, declined to receive her as a slave, and said, "Surry must be free on crossing the threshold of my house."[1] This showed an advance from the time of Cotton Mather, who entered in his diary in 1706 that he "received a singular blessing" in the gift of "a very likely slave," which was "a mighty smile of Heaven upon his family." In 1783 slavery came to an end in Massachusetts, by the decision of the Supreme Court, which held that the declaration inserted in the State Constitution of 1780, that "all men are born free and equal," abolished slavery forever.[2] In the first census of the inhabitants of the United States, in 1790, only free persons were returned from Massachusetts, the only State in the Union which did not then hold slaves, and the only State represented in the first Congress, in 1789, which had formally abolished slavery.[3]

With such antecedents and traditions, it was natural that Massachusetts and Boston should be the home and centre of the last and successful movement for abolishing slavery throughout the whole Union.

William Lloyd Garrison, the leader of the movement, whose name will stand forever among those which the world will not willingly let die, was not a Boston boy indeed, though a son of Massachusetts. He was born in Newburyport,[4] Dec. 10, 1805, his father being a sea-captain, and his mother a member of the Baptists, and a deeply religious woman. From her he probably inherited his profoundly religious tendency and his strength of moral conviction. After trying one or two other trades he became a printer; and subsequently editor, in succession, of two or three newspapers, the last being a political journal in Bennington, Vermont. From this place he was taken by Benjamin Lundy to Baltimore, in 1829, to assist in editing his Antislavery paper, the *Genius of Universal Emancipation*. His style of writing roused great opposition; and soon an article in which he denounced a Mr. Todd, a fellow-townsman, for taking in his vessel a cargo of eighty slaves from Baltimore to New Orleans, caused him to be prosecuted for libel, and sent to jail from inability to pay the fine of fifty dollars. This caused much excitement through the country. Joseph T. Buckingham, of the *Boston Courier*, a man who had "somewhat in him gritty,"[5] printed two sonnets written by Garrison in prison. John G. Whittier, then, or a little later, editing a Whig paper in Hartford, wrote to Henry Clay, telling him the case, and asking him to pay the fine. Clay inclined to do so, but requested further information from a gentleman in Baltimore. Meantime the fine was paid by Arthur Tappan, a leading New York merchant. Garrison then

[1] Robert Dickson Smith's *Oration*, July 5, 1880.

[2] [See the note on this point in J. P. Quincy's chapter on "Social Life in Boston," in Vol. IV. p. 6. — Ed.]

[3] Theodore Lyman's *Report*, as above.

[4] [See a view of his birthplace in *Harper's Magazine*, 1875, ii. 166. — Ed.]

[5] "Thought I, my neighbor Buckingham
Hath somewhat in him gritty,
Some Pilgrim stuff that hates all sham,
And he will print my ditty." — Lowell.

proposed establishing an Antislavery paper in Washington; but considering that the North needed conversion as much as the South, and ought to be made the fulcrum for his lever, he came to Boston, and, Jan. 1, 1831, published the first number of the *Liberator*.[1]

Mr. Oliver Johnson, one of the earliest associates of Mr. Garrison, has given us a picture of the humble room and poor surroundings, — "the obscure hole," as it was called by the mayor of the city, — where

> "In a small chamber, friendless and unseen,
> Toiled o'er his types one poor, unlearned young man;
> The place was dark, unfurnitured, and mean,
> Yet there the freedom of a race began."

"Everything around it," says Mr. Johnson, "had an aspect of slovenly decay. The dingy walls; the small windows, bespattered with printer's ink; the press standing in one corner, the composing stands opposite; the long editorial and mailing table, covered with newspapers; the bed of the editor and publisher on the floor, — all these made a picture never to be forgotten."

Garrison was singularly adapted to the work for which Providence selected him. He had a manifest calling, and he gave such diligence as to make it sure. Conscience, reason, and will were the leading elements of his character. His conscience caused him in each instance to ask, in regard to every action, custom, or institution, "Is it right or wrong?" His understanding was in the highest degree logical, and to his mind every proposition was either true or false. He was not one of those who perceive much to be said on both sides, and who sometimes confuse the clearness of their judgment by too much balancing in their thought. His fault was never that of indecision; he saw none of the fine shades which make a mild transition from one opinion to its opposite; and having decided what ought to be believed and done, nothing could afterward shake the persistency of his purpose. As Dr. Wayland said of John Howard: "Having formed his determination, he went forward to its accomplishment with an energy which the nature of the human mind prevented from being more, and the character of the individual forbade to be less." In these traits of Garrison we see reproduced the main elements of New England Puritanism, — its high moral tone; its intensity of conviction; its colorless, unpicturesque, and somewhat narrow methods of thought; its readiness to make

[1] These facts, and others here given, are taken from Oliver Johnson's book, *Garrison and his Times*. Oliver Johnson and Samuel E. Sewall are almost the only survivors of those who were with Garrison from the very first. [Sets of the *Liberator*, so important to the study of the Antislavery movement, have fortunately been preserved in various places. Mr. F. J. Garrison reports twelve sets nearly complete: Boston Public Library, Boston Athenæum, Harvard College Library, Cornell University Library, Rhode Island Historical Society at Providence, American Antiquarian Society at Worcester, Library of Congress, Long Island Historical Society at Brooklyn, Portland Public Library, Wendell Phillips, Esq., Miss Caroline Weston, of Weymouth, Mass., and the family of Mr. Garrison. See further on the *Liberator*, in Mr. Cummings's chapter in this volume. — Ed.]

any sacrifice to its convictions; and that energy of will which has given it such commanding power on both continents.



WILLIAM LLOYD GARRISON.[1]

The one question which Mr. Garrison asked concerning slavery was, "Is it right, or is it wrong?" This question was easily answered; and the

[1] [This likeness follows a daguerreotype by Chase, taken about 1853, and selected by the kindred of Mr. Garrison for the engraver's purpose. The Editor is indebted to Mr. Wendell P. Garrison for the following statement: —

"The number of portraits of Mr. Garrison, in every variety of medium, is very great. For the print-collector only four need be mentioned, namely: 1) A line-engraving on steel, by S. S. Jocelyn, after the full-size oil-painting from life, by N. Jocelyn, made in New Haven in April, 1833. The engraving was copyrighted just a year later. The likeness would not now be recognized readily, and was at the time considered a total failure. (2) A mezzotint, by John Sartain, after the cabinet oil-painting from life, by M. C. Torrey, made about 1836. Though faulty in its proportions, this likeness approves itself by its resemblance to Mr. Garrison's later aspect. The originals of both these portraits, which are front views, are now in the possession

natural inference was — "Being wrong, it ought to be immediately relinquished." Hence the fundamental doctrine of the Abolitionists, — the duty of immediate emancipation. To many this seemed a monstrous proposition. "What," they said; "set free at once more than two million slaves, — ignorant, helpless, vicious? This would be a curse to the slave and his master alike. These two millions do not own a dollar of property; they have nothing they can call their own; not an acre of land; no tools; no habits of foresight or self-control. You say slavery is a bad thing; bad in all its influence on slaves and master. If so, it has unfitted the slaves for freedom; it has depraved their characters; it has kept them children. To emancipate them at once would be like turning all the little children out into the streets to support themselves. No! Slaves ought not all to be immediately emancipated. They ought to be gradually prepared for freedom by some kind of education."

Something like this was the universal answer to Garrison's demand; but it did not disturb him. He fell back on his postulate: "Slavery is wrong. Every wrong act should be immediately abandoned. Therefore slavery ought at once to cease. Do right, and leave the results to God."

When pressed more closely in regard to the consequences of his proposed measure, he would explain his meaning thus: "By immediate emancipation I do not mean that the slaveholder should turn his slaves out of doors. I mean that he should at once recognize that they are no longer to be held as slaves, but to be regarded as free people, of whom he is the temporary guardian. I mean that he should allow those to leave him who desire it, and pay wages to those who remain." And this was, in fact, very nearly the actual solution of the situation when immediate emancipation came as the result of the Civil War.

The often quoted words in Garrison's opening address to the public in the first number of the *Liberator* indicated its whole course. He said: —

"I am aware that many object to the severity of my language; but is there not cause for severity? I *will be* as harsh as truth, and as uncompromising as justice. On this subject I do not wish to think, or speak, or write, with moderation. No! no! Tell a man whose house is on fire to give a moderate alarm; tell him to moderately rescue his wife from the hands of the ravisher; tell the mother to gradually extricate her babe from the fire into which it has fallen, — but urge me not to use moderation in a cause like the present. I am in earnest; I will not equivocate; I will not retreat a single inch, — AND I WILL BE HEARD."

of Edward M. Davis, Esq., of Philadelphia. (3) A lithograph, by Louis Grozelier, after the daguerreotype above mentioned, with the advantage of personal sittings, published in Boston by William C. Nell in 1854. This, though a little hard in drawing, is perhaps the most characteristic and vigorous of all the multiplied likenesses. The somewhat stern expression comports well with the motto beneath, — 'I am in earnest,' etc. (4) A line-and-stipple engraving, by F. T. Stuart, Boston, after a photograph by Warren, serving as frontispiece to Johnson's *Garrison and his Times* (1880). The view here is three-quarters to the right. The copy is very true to the original, which is well esteemed among the photographic likenesses of Mr. Garrison's latest years. Neither the bust by Clevenger nor that by Jackson was successful; but Miss Anne Whitney's (1878) is to be praised without reserve. In John Rogers's statuette group, 'The Fugitive's Story,' Mr. Garrison's head is carefully and not badly modelled, but the figure is stiffly posed."

The present likeness represents Mr. Garrison at the age of about forty-eight. His later years were passed in a house on Highland Street, in Roxbury. — ED.]

No one can say that Mr. Garrison did not fulfil to the letter this programme. He did not equivocate; he did not retreat; and he was heard! This trumpet uttered no uncertain sound; this soldier never fought as one who beat the air; this voice was heard and listened to year after year by increasing numbers. And now, looking back on the long conflict and its results, it is difficult to see how any other method could have been successful. Margaret Fuller explained in one fitting sentence the reason of the extreme sharpness of speech of the Abolitionists: "The nation was deaf in regard to the evils of slavery; and those who have to speak to deaf people naturally acquire the habit of saying everything on a very high key." The people would hardly have gone out into that wilderness of solitary convictions where Garrison and his few friends were, "to see a reed shaken by the wind" or "a man clothed in soft raiment;" but they *did* go out to hear Garrison. Nine years after the first issue of the *Liberator* there were nearly two thousand Antislavery societies, with a membership of about two hundred thousand persons.[1]

The first meeting for the purpose of forming an Antislavery Society on these principles was held in the office of Samuel E. Sewall, then a rising young lawyer of Boston, Nov. 13, 1831. Another followed, December 16. The names of those present, besides Mr. Garrison and Mr. Sewall, were Ellis Gray Loring and David Lee Child, Boston lawyers; Isaac Knapp, publisher of the *Liberator;* Samuel J. May, Unitarian minister, settled in Brooklyn, Connecticut, who was at the November meeting; Oliver Johnson, William J. Snelling, Alonzo Lewis, Abner Phelps, Abijah Blanchard, and Gamaliel Bradford. A constitution was drafted by Ellis Gray Loring and Oliver Johnson. The meeting for adopting this constitution was held, Jan. 6, 1832, in a school-room under the African Church on Belknap Street. It was a dismal night; a fierce snow-storm was raging outside, and within the room were a very few persons, scarcely known, with neither wealth nor influence; but then and there they united to overthrow the vast system of American slavery, — and in this effort they succeeded. Before that generation had passed away the work was done, and the society was disbanded as being no longer necessary. Then, as often in the course of history, it happened that God "chose the foolish things of this world to confound the wise; and weak things to confound the mighty; and things which were despised, and things which were not, to bring to nought things that were."

Before Mr. Garrison had been engaged in this work many years he was surrounded by a body of devoted friends and fellow-laborers, many of them belonging to this city by birth or residence. In Boston, and by the help of Boston men, he found the ποῦ στῶ, the fulcrum for his lever, by which to move the world. Among these Bostonians we may mention the names of Samuel E. Sewall, Ellis Gray Loring and his wife Louisa Loring, Mrs. Maria W. Chapman and her sisters the Misses Weston, Samuel J. May, David Lee Child and his wife Lydia Maria Child, Henry I. Bowditch, William I. Bow-

[1] Wilson's *Rise and Fall of the Slave Power*, i. 187.

ditch, George Bradburn, Ralph Waldo Emerson, Charles Follen, John Pierpont, Francis Jackson, Charles F. Hovey, Eliza Lee Follen, Susan Cabot, Charles K. Whipple, Lucy Stone, and many others. Younger than most of these, but among the leaders, were Wendell Phillips and Edmund Quincy. Conspicuous for their Antislavery action, though not so closely affiliated with the Antislavery Society, were William Ellery Channing, Theodore Parker, Charles Sumner, Samuel G. Howe, Horace Mann, John A. Andrew, and John G. Palfrey.

Prominent among these associates of Garrison, both by his unsurpassed ability as an orator, his ready dialectics, and his unswerving devotion to the Antislavery cause, was Wendell Phillips. Born in Boston in 1811, son of the first mayor of the city, he graduated at Harvard in the class of 1831, and in the law-class of 1834. A witness of the mobbing of Garrison in 1835, he joined the Antislavery Society in 1836, and first appeared as an Antislavery speaker in the meeting occasioned by the murder of Lovejoy in 1837. From that time forward, until the final abolition of slavery, his time, thought, and means were devoted to this subject. As a public speaker he has been excelled by none, in our day, in the power of holding a miscellaneous audience, even when most hostile to himself and his ideas. Calm and self-possessed, speaking with deliberation, — without that fiery flow of thoughts and words which many consider as alone deserving the name of eloquence, — he charms his audience by clear, strong statement, happy illustration, unexpected surprises, unremitting appeals to human hopes and fears, loves and hates, and by contempt for baseness and admiration for truth and manly courage.

Another leader in the Garrisonian body was Edmund Quincy. Belonging to a family[2] in which patriotism, manly independence, and fearless speech have been transmitted from generation to generation, it was a good day for Antislavery in Boston when he gave to it his share of such an inheritance. With less fluency on the platform than Phillips, his clear, good sense, sharp logic, self-possession, and imperturbable determination made him an interesting speaker and formidable antagonist. He added to these qualities one very rare among these stern reformers, — a keen and brilliant wit. Satire and sarcasm they possessed abundantly; but only Edmund Quincy in Boston, and John P. Hale in the United States Senate were able to make fun of their antagonists while they demolished their arguments, and to speak the sober truth merrily. During many years a correspondent of the New York *Antislavery Standard* and the *New York Tribune*, the letters of Edmund Quincy sparkled with wit; and a very entertaining and instructive history of the times might be made by a judicious selection from those letters.

Several members of the Boston Bar did not hesitate early to identify themselves with the obnoxious Garrisonian Abolitionists, and prominent among

[1] [He was the son of the elder Mayor Quincy. — Ed.]

them to the last were Ellis Gray Loring, Samuel E. Sewall, and David Lee Child. Mr. Loring was wise, calm, strong, and gentle; a man more fond of literature and home than of the stormy Antislavery arena; but he was one always to be relied on to devote his hand, thought, heart, and means to the cause he accounted sacred. Mr. Sewall is still living among us in an honored age, and his modesty forbids that we should say more of him than this, — that in the long line of worthies who have honored the name of Sewall in Massachusetts, none will be found more deserving of her grateful remembrance than he.

Among the clergymen who very early took part with the Garrisonians were Amos A. Phelps, Samuel J. May, Samuel May, Jr., and Charles Follen. Less intimately connected with them, but warmly sympathizing with their purpose, were John Pierpont, Theodore Parker, Caleb Stetson, Henry Ware, Jr., Charles Lowell, John G. Palfrey, and others not so closely identified with Boston. Amos A. Phelps was the pastor of the Pine-Street Church, and his conversion to Antislavery was due to one of his parishioners, — Oliver Johnson. Besides other services, he helped the movement by contributing the definition of slavery which was accepted by all the Abolitionists as the basis of their action: "Slavery is the holding of a human being as property." Samuel J. May and Samuel May, Jr., nearly related to each other, and belonging to one of the most highly respected families in Boston, were always intimate friends of Garrison, and co-workers with him. Charles Follen, a native of Germany, and an exile for his liberal principles, also adopted this cause, — unpopular among most of his friends, but congenial to his convictions and his heart. John Pierpont — orator, poet, reformer, champion of human rights, a terror to evil-doers — did not hesitate in putting himself on the same side. John G. Palfrey, a representative from Boston in Congress, having forfeited that position by his speeches and votes against slavery and its extension, illustrated his sincerity by an act which won for him the high esteem of well-thinking men. Becoming heir to a part of the estate of his father, a resident in New Orleans, his brother offered to take the slaves as his own share, leaving other property for his Boston brother. This Dr. Palfrey declined, because it would be, in his judgment, equivalent to selling the slaves. He therefore took his portion of the slaves and emancipated them, brought them to Boston and found homes and occupation for them here.

A most important accession in Boston to the Antislavery movement was when William Ellery Channing — then in the height of his influence and fame — identified himself with it by his work on Slavery (1835); his letter to James G. Birney on "The Abolitionists" (1836); his appearance by the side of the Abolitionists in the State House in the same year; his demand in 1837 for the use of Faneuil Hall for a meeting to denounce the killing of Lovejoy in Alton; his speech at that meeting; and numerous publications in relation to slavery, from that time until the end of his life. But his world-wide reputation, his services to religion, literature, and good morals did not

save him from bitter criticism and opposition from the Boston press, and even from members of his own congregation. Though moderate in his statements, doing full justice to the slaveholder, and differing from the Garrisonian Abolitionists in many of their methods, it was enough that he was an earnest opposer of slavery and defender of the Abolitionists, to draw down on him the wrath of many of the leading citizens of Boston. In his book on Slavery he had laid down the principles that "man cannot be justly held and used as property;" that "he has sacred rights, the gift of God, and inseparable from human nature, of which slavery is the infraction." In his letter to Birney in 1836 he said of the Abolitionists: "When I regard their firm, fearless assertion of the rights of free discussion, of speech, and the press, I look on them with unmixed respect. . . . I do not hesitate to say that they have rendered to freedom a more essential service than any body of men among us. From my heart I thank them. I am myself their debtor. I am not sure that I should this moment write in safety had they shrunk from the conflict, shut their lips, imposed silence on their presses. A body of men and women more blameless than the Abolitionists cannot be found among us." Saying such words as these was enough in those days to change many of Dr. Channing's admirers into revilers and opponents. Dr. Channing had been much impressed with the wrong and evil of slavery during a visit to the West Indies in 1830, caused by ill health. On his return to Boston in 1831 he addressed his society, and spoke especially of what he had seen of slavery, saying such words as these: "I think no power can do justice to the evils of slavery. They are chiefly moral; they act on the mind, and through the mind bring intense suffering to the body. As far as the human soul can be destroyed, slavery is the destroyer. The slave is regarded as property, having no rights. I feel that we have little perception of the infinite evil of slavery, and I desire earnestly that a new sentiment should be called forth."

Lydia Maria Child, an ardent Abolitionist and able writer, whose *Appeal in favor of that Class of Americans called Africans* had just been published (1833), gives an account of her interviews with Dr. Channing at this period, in which she says: —

> "At every interview I could see that he grew bolder and stronger on the subject, while I felt that I grew wiser and more just. At first I thought him timid and even slightly timeserving, but I soon discovered that I formed this estimate from ignorance of his character. I learned that it was justice to *all*, not popularity for *himself*, which made him so cautious. He constantly grew upon my respect, until I came to regard him as the wisest as well as the gentlest apostle of humanity."

A little later than this, in the autumn of 1834, Samuel J. May describes an interview with Dr. Channing, which probably hastened the publication of his work on Slavery, which he began at Santa Cruz, but only printed in 1835. Mr. May had identified himself with Garrison from the beginning. He says that he always cherished such a reverence for Dr. Chan-

ning that he was inclined to defer to his opinions, and accept them in silence. On this occasion Dr. Channing, while expressing his agreement with the Abolitionists in all their essential doctrines, complained of their harsh denunciations, their violent language, and frequent injustice to their opponents; to which Mr. May at last replied: "If this is so, Sir, it is your fault. You have held your peace, and the stones have cried out. If we, who are obscure men, silly women, babes in knowledge, commit these errors, why do not such men as yourself speak, and show us the right way?" Having thus spoken, "I bethought myself," says Mr. May, "to whom I was administering this rebuke, — the best and greatest of our great and good men, who had ever treated me as a father. I was overwhelmed with a sense of my temerity. I waited, in painful silence, his reply. At last, in a subdued voice and the kindest tones, he said: 'Brother May, I acknowledge the justice of your reproof. I have been silent too long.'"

Samuel J. May, who gives us this anecdote, was himself a very remarkable man. In him was seen not only the rare union but the perfect harmony of strength and sweetness, leonine courage and kindly sympathy. He would be burned at the stake for his convictions, but would not unnecessarily hurt a fly. His presence was persuasion; and there were few opponents whose prejudices were not softened by his frank good-will. Anecdotes are related of Southern slave-holders who, meeting him with fury on account of his abolition sentiments, ended by becoming his warm friends.

Early in August, 1835, fifteen hundred prominent citizens of Boston appended their names to a call for a public meeting in Faneuil Hall, to denounce the agitation of slavery as putting in peril the existence of the Union. At this meeting men of influence charged the Abolitionists with being disturbers of the public peace, and endangering the safety of the country. The newspapers, with hardly an exception, took the same tone. The Abolitionists had sent a large number of tracts and papers to the South, — not intended for the slaves, few of whom could read them, but for the masters, whom they wished to convert. They were, however, accused both at the North and South of seeking to stir up the slaves to insurrection, and wishing them to cut their masters' throats. The community in Boston was excited against Mr. Garrison and his friends. The language of the Abolitionists was no doubt severe, and could not be otherwise. They were determined to arouse the conscience of the people. They did not strike in order to strike, but in order to hit. Their object was to rouse a sleeping nation, and woe was laid on them if they did their work negligently. At the same time let us do justice to those who then resisted the Abolitionists. The fear of losing Southern trade, and having Southern customers driven from Boston to New York, no doubt had its influence; but with this was joined an honest sympathy with the difficulties and dangers of those living in Southern States, an honest fear that the violent

speech of the Abolitionists would endanger the peace of the land, and that it would postpone the gradual emancipation which many were then expecting. The Abolitionists were commonly regarded as wild and reckless fanatics, who were ready to stir up strife between North and South, and excite the slaves to insurrection and murder. This was the prevailing public opinion in Boston during the first years of the Antislavery movement. It was shared by all classes, — lawyers, legislators, the clergy, the press, and the people generally. The conversation in the parlors of the fashionable, the coarse profanity of the drinking saloons, the speeches in the Legislature, and the leaders in the newspapers were in full sympathy on this subject. Every man who was willing to identify himself with Mr. Garrison and his movement did it at the risk of alienating his friends, losing his business, hurting the feelings of those dearest to him, and encountering the scorn and ill-will of the community. The worst of these trials was that of being condemned by really good men, — men justly respected in Church and State. It seemed, also, a hopeless struggle, "a warfare," as Bryant said, which would "only end with life; a friendless warfare, lingering through weary day and weary year, in which the timid good stood aloof, the sage frowned, and the hissing bolt of scorn would too surely reach its aim." Well-meaning men went so far as to be willing to give up the sacred guarantees of freedom in order to stop the press and shut the mouths of Abolitionists. Mr. William Sullivan, an excellent lawyer and worthy gentleman of Boston, printed a pamphlet, in which was expressed the hope "that Massachusetts will enact laws declaring the printing, publishing, and circulating pamphlets on slavery, and also holding meetings to discuss slavery and abolition, to be public, indictable offences, and to provide for the punishment thereof in such a manner as will more effectually prevent such offences." Leonard Woods, Jr., declared in the *Literary and Theological Review*, edited by him, that Abolitionists "were justly liable to the highest civil penalties and ecclesiastical censures." And Governor Everett, in his message to the Massachusetts Legislature in January, 1836, expressed the opinion that the Antislavery movement would injure the condition of the slave and endanger the Union; and that any publication calculated "to excite an insurrection among the slaves had been held by highly respectable legal authority an offence against the peace of the Commonwealth, which may be prosecuted as a misdemeanor at common law." Such being the general state of opinion among all classes of society, it is no wonder that these views soon resulted, in some of the Northern States, in acts of violence and outrage against the property and persons of the Abolitionists. Such was the violent suppression of Miss Crandall's school for colored girls in Canterbury, Conn.; such were the mobs in New York which sacked the house of Lewis Tappan; the mobs which destroyed Mr. Birney's press in Cincinnati, and broke up the meeting in Utica. Samuel J. May was mobbed five times in Vermont in one month. A hall in Philadelphia, built at an expense of $40,000 by the friends of free speech, was burned to the ground

by a mob, in the presence of the mayor and his police; and the public meeting held in Faneuil Hall, to denounce the Abolitionists, was followed, in two months, by the mob of "well-dressed gentlemen," which dispersed a meeting of women, destroyed an Antislavery sign, and threatened the life of Mr. Garrison. A lasting discredit rested on Boston from this transaction. It is another instance of the mischief which results when the reckless and turbulent few take the lead, and the more numerous timidly-good remain passive.

The facts in regard to this mob were these.[1] Great offence had been taken because George Thompson, an eminent and eloquent English Antislavery orator, had delivered public addresses in the United States against American slavery. This was thought to be a matter with which foreigners had nothing to do. The people of Boston forgot the assistance they had rendered to the Greeks in their insurrection against the Turkish tyranny, and how they had delighted in the eloquence of Webster, Clay, and Everett exerted in behalf of an oppressed people in a foreign land. It was right apparently for Americans, though foreigners, to speak in behalf of Greek slaves, but wrong for English foreigners to speak in behalf of American slaves. Mr. Thompson, before he came to this country, had done such service for the emancipation of slaves in the West Indies that in 1833, when the Act of Emancipation was passed, Lord Brougham said in the House of Lords: "I rise to take the crown of this most glorious victory from every other head, and place it upon George Thompson's. He has done more than any other man to achieve it." Having accomplished this work at home, Mr. Thompson accepted an invitation from the Abolitionists of America to come and speak in behalf of freedom here. He was immediately greeted with the title of "a British emissary," hired by "British gold," to destroy the American Union. He was denounced in Faneuil Hall by Harrison Gray Otis, Peleg Sprague, and Richard Fletcher. It is difficult to understand the degree of excitement and blind prejudice which then prevailed. The *Boston Centinel* called Thompson "a foreign vagrant," who would never be allowed to address another meeting in this country. The *Boston Courier* called him "a scoundrel," and "a vagabond." The *Commercial Gazette* was astonished that "he should dare to browbeat public opinion," and suggested that he and Garrison should be "thrown overboard" if they ventured to speak again.

While the feeling thus excited was at its height, a meeting was announced of the Boston Female Antislavery Society, to be held Oct. 21, 1835, in the building, 46 Washington Street, where the *Liberator* was printed. An incendiary placard was issued the same day, at 12 o'clock, from the office of the *Commercial Gazette*, announcing that "the infamous foreign scoundrel, Thompson, will hold forth this afternoon at the *Liberator*

[1] *Liberator* (see the Nos. for October and November, 1835). *Proceedings of the Antislavery meeting, held on the Twentieth Anniversary of the Mob of Oct. 21, 1855. The Garrison Mob. Papers relating to the Mob*, edited by Theodore Lyman, 3rd.

office, No. 46 Washington Street. The present is a fair opportunity for the friends of the Union to snake Thompson out." It added that one hundred dollars had been raised to be paid to the man who should "first lay violent hands on Thompson, that he might be brought to the tar-kettle before dark." George Thompson, however, was not at the meeting, nor in the city; nor had he been invited to speak. The crowd, however, early collected, and prevented all but about thirty women from entering. Some of the mob crowded into the room. Amid this tumult the ladies calmly proceeded with their business, Miss Mary Parker offering prayer in a clear and serene voice. Meantime the mayor, Theodore Lyman, who before had sent some officers to protect the building and keep out the mob, arrived himself, cleared the building of the rioters, and urged the ladies to retire, as it might not be in his power, with his small force, to protect them long. This they did, the police making a passage for them through the mob. But though the mayor assured the crowd that Mr. Thompson was not in the building, it did not disperse, but became larger and more noisy. The mayor and his officers continued to defend the entrance of the building; but finding that the mob now clamored for Garrison, he went upstairs and advised Mr. Garrison to leave the house by a private way which led into Wilson's Lane behind. This Mr. Garrison did, but with calmness, as he continued to do all things during the whole affair. Then the mayor went down again to the door, and fearing that the Antislavery sign might induce the mob to throw stones at it, and so be led on to further violence, directed it to be taken into the house. Instead of this, however, it was put into the hands of the mob, and destroyed. Meantime, Mr. Garrison had been intercepted by some of the mob, a rope was coiled round his body, "probably," as he says in his account written at the time, "to drag me through the streets." He adds: "I fortunately extricated myself from the rope, and was seized by two or three powerful men, to whose firmness, policy, and muscular energy I am probably indebted for my preservation. They led me through the streets bare-headed; through a mighty crowd, ever and anon shouting: 'He sha'n't be hurt! You sha'n't hurt him! Don't hurt him! He is an American!' This seemed to excite sympathy among many of the crowd, and they reiterated the cry, 'He sha'n't be hurt!'" As Garrison and those who held him approached the City Hall, then in the Old State House, the mayor and peace officers, together with his sturdy protectors, succeeded in getting him into the City Hall. Thence he was sent in a carriage to the jail for temporary security; and shortly returned to his office and his work.[1]

[1] These facts are taken from Mr. Garrison's statements made in the *Liberator*, just after these events; from Samuel E. Sewall's statement written at the same time; from the mayor's account, afterward published; and from a comparison of the accounts of eye-witnesses. Yet eye-witnesses are sometimes mistaken. The story of the rope round Garrison's neck, which the *Liberator* at the time positively contradicted, came from a man who professed to be an eye-witness. In Mr. Garrison's statement at the time, quoted in the text, he describes those who held him as his protectors. This does not appear in his account given twenty years after, which runs thus: "The most active of the rioters found me in the second story of

As soon as it was known that the Antislavery women had been expelled from their room by the mob, Francis Jackson invited them to continue and conclude their meeting at his own house; and they did so. He well knew the danger. It was not improbable that the mob might attack and destroy his house, and endanger the safety of its inmates; but he was determined that there should be freedom of speech in Boston, if he had the power of securing it, at whatever peril. A calm, unpretending, silent man, — in common times never putting himself forward, — he was one of those who show the temper of heroes in the hour which tries men's souls.

The next event of much importance was in the following year, 1836. That part of Governor Everett's message which related to the Abolitionists had been referred to a joint legislative committee of five, of which George Lunt, of Newburyport, was chairman. To the same committee were also referred the communications from the Legislatures of slaveholding States, making it penal for citizens of non-slaveholding States to speak or write against slavery. Samuel J. May, Ellis Gray Loring, Mr. Garrison, William Goodell, and Professor Charles Follen addressed the committee in opposition to any action against Abolitionists on the part of the Legislature. Dr. Follen was interrupted by Mr. Lunt, and was told that he and his associates were there to exculpate themselves, and not to instruct the committee. Mr. May denied that they were there as culprits. They complained to the Legislature of the treatment they had received, and had another hearing, at which the same gentlemen spoke again, together with Samuel E. Sewall. Mr. Lunt, as before, repeatedly interrupted the speakers in a threatening manner. He was, however, rebuked for this, not only by Mr. Moseley, one of his associates, but also by Mr. George Bond, a merchant of high standing, who declared that in his opinion the committee was too fastidious. It was on this occasion that the incident took place which Miss Martineau described in a picturesque way in her article on "The Martyr-age of America."

"While the committee were, with ostentatious negligence, keeping the Abolitionists waiting, they, to whom this business was a prelude to life or death, were earnestly consulting in groups. At the further end of the chamber, Garrison and another; somewhat nearer, Dr. Follen, looking German all over, and a deeper earnestness than usual overspreading his serene and meditative countenance. In consultation with him was Ellis Gray Loring, only too frail in form, but with a face radiant with inward light. There were May and Goodell and Sewall and several more, and many an anxious wife, sister, or friend looking down from the gallery. During the suspense the door opened and Dr. Channing entered, — one of the last people who could on that wintry afternoon have been expected. He stood a few moments, muffled in his cloak and shawl-handkerchief, and then walked the whole length of the room, and was immediately seen

the carpenter's shop alluded to, and, coiling a rope round my body, let me down to the crowd below. I was dragged, bare-headed, through the streets, when my clothes were nearly all torn from my body, etc." After reading all the accounts, it seems evident that the mayor did all he could do, with the small means at his disposal. [Compare the statements in Mr. Bugbee's chapter on "Boston Under the Mayors." There is a circumstantial account of this mob, by Ellis Ames, who was an eye-witness, in *Mass. Hist. Soc. Proc.*, 1881. — Ed.]

shaking hands with Garrison. A murmur ran through the gallery, and a smile went round the chamber. Mrs. Chapman whispered to her next neighbor, 'Righteousness and peace have kissed each other!' Garrison, the dauntless Garrison, turned pale as ashes, and sank down on a seat. Dr. Channing had censured the Abolitionists in his pamphlet on Slavery; Garrison had, in the *Liberator*, rejected the censure; and here they were shaking hands in the Senate chamber. Dr. Channing sat behind the speakers, handing them notes, and most obviously affording them his countenance, so as to be from that day considered by the world as an accession to their principles, though not to their organized body."

The result was that Mr. Lunt in his report strongly condemned the Abolitionists, and added some resolutions wholly disapproving their doctrines and measures; but the Legislature laid report and resolutions on the table, and there they remained, and were never acted on.

In the next year, 1837, occurred some of the memorable debates in Congress on the right of petition, in which John Quincy Adams held a position hardly ever equalled by any speaker in a deliberative body. Maintaining the right of petition, against the solid South and a large part of the Northern representatives, he stood like a rock in mid-ocean, against which a thousand storms beat in vain. Though not a representative from Boston, yet through the grandeur of his position, his immovable purpose, his vast resources of knowledge, his keen intellect, he triumphantly defended the rights of the whole North against the assumptions of slavery, — and the hearts of Antislavery men in Boston were strengthened by that triumph.

In November of the same year Elijah P. Lovejoy was killed in Alton, while defending his press which a mob was seeking to destroy. A petition for the use of Faneuil Hall for a meeting to protest against this violation of the principles of liberty, signed by Dr. Channing and others, was rejected by the Boston authorities. With fearless promptitude Dr. Channing issued an appeal to the citizens of Boston, calling on them to reverse this action of the city government. A meeting at the Supreme Court room, presided over by George Bond, passed resolutions prepared by Benjamin F. Hallett, demanding of the mayor and aldermen to change their course and give the hall. They did so, and the meeting was held. Jonathan Phillips presided. Dr. Channing made an impressive address in favor of the right of free discussion, violated by the murder of Lovejoy. He was followed, in the same sense, by Benjamin F. Hallett and George S. Hillard, a young lawyer, not then known to fame. Wendell Phillips was to have followed, but the floor was taken by the Attorney-general of the State, James Trécothic Austin, who declared that Lovejoy "died as the fool dieth," and that the men who killed him were as great patriots as those who threw the tea into Boston harbor. He was loudly cheered by a large part of the meeting, and Wendell Phillips, who then ascended the platform, was hooted at by the crowd; but in spite of their opposition and outcries he held his ground, and sternly rebuked the speech of Austin. "When I heard," said he, "the gentleman lay down principles which placed the murderers of Alton side by side with

Otis and Hancock, with Quincy and Adams, I thought those pictured lips," pointing to their portraits, "would have broken into voice to rebuke the recreant American, the slanderer of the dead." From that hour Wendell Phillips took his place among the great orators of the land.

The combination of interests, beliefs, and habits which supported slavery in the United States was so powerful that it seemed madness in the Abolitionists to hope for success against them. First, there was the pecuniary value of the slaves to the South, amounting even then, as was computed, to one thousand millions of dollars. But if that vast sum had been voted by Congress as compensation for the slaves, it would have been refused on account of the difficulties and dangers of emancipation. More than that, slavery had become an ingrained part of the system of life in the Southern States; and it was believed that the whole fabric of society would be rent asunder by emancipation. Nor would any Southern community have consented, for any amount that could be offered, to allow the negroes when emancipated to remain among them; and if they were bought by the North, and all sent out of the country, where would laborers and servants be found to take their place? As against emancipation, then, the South was a unit, though some of the border States were not opposed to emancipation if it could be connected with deportation of the colored people. The slaveholders, being united, controlled the politics of the South; and the South, being united, controlled the politics of the nation. They held great majorities in Congress; they elected pro-slavery presidents; they took possession of the Federal courts; the Federal power in its three branches — legislative, executive, and judicial — was held firmly in their hands. They controlled the merchants of the North by their trade, the newspapers of the North through their business; both the fashion of the North and the mobs were on their side. Not satisfied with this, the slave-power proceeded to strengthen its position by a series of successful aggressions. In 1845 it annexed Texas, then a Free State belonging to Mexico, with the avowed purpose of cutting it into four slave States, and so to add eight slaveholders to the United States Senate. It obtained a new and stringent Fugitive-Slave Law, by which to seize fugitives at the North. It repealed the Missouri Compromise, which prohibited the extension of slavery into Territories north of a certain parallel, so as to allow the slaveholders to carry their slaves where they would. It obtained the opinion of the U. S. Supreme Court, in the Dred Scott case, to the same effect. It took possession of Kansas by violence, murdering men whose only crime it was to wish to make it a free State; and struck down Charles Sumner on the floor of Congress. Such was the great and constantly increasing strength of the slave-power.

And what had the Abolitionists to oppose to it? They had no political, social, or fashionable influence. They were mostly poor, and all were unpopular. They had nothing on their side but Truth, Justice, and God. Relying on these they were strong, eloquent, brave, untiring. Their methods

were simple and few. They formed Antislavery societies, held public meetings, published newspapers, tracts, and books. They took advantage of every new act and aggression of the slave-power to appeal to the popular indignation against wrong. They had on their side poets like Whittier, Lowell, Longfellow, Pierpont, and Bryant; orators like Phillips, Fred. Douglass, Theodore D. Weld, Stephen Foster, Parker Pillsbury, and a multitude of others. They had noble women working for them in their societies, speaking on the platform, writing books and pamphlets; such women as Maria Weston Chapman, Lucretia Mott, Louisa Loring, Lydia Maria Child, Lucy Stone, Abby Kelley, Sarah and Angelina Grimké. At their meetings were to be seen fugitive slaves, telling with their lips what they had known of the barbarities of slavery, — like William and Ellen Craft, Henry Box Brown, and Father Henson. They welcomed to their platform the defenders of slavery, and any slaveholder who chanced to be in Boston was sure to have every opportunity for the freest speech, — sure, also, of being answered as he had never been answered before. Every outrage on freedom brought new converts to their side; every triumph of the slave-power was the text for more convincing arguments against the system which could only live by such encroachments on the rights of all. The best thought of the North, like that of Ralph Waldo Emerson, came to their side. The "enraged eloquence" of their meetings drew crowds to listen. Men were there who struck and spared not, — men like Stephen S. Foster, Parker Pillsbury, and Henry C. Wright, to whom there was nothing sacred in Church or State when allied with slavery. They denounced the church as "a brotherhood of thieves;" they cursed the Constitution of the United States, which called on them to surrender fugitives. The higher the position of a man, if he was on the wrong side, the better they liked to strike him. Stormy and tumultuous were these debates, often interrupted, sometimes broken up by the mob, but never commonplace or tame. The attacks of the Abolitionists on the churches were excused, if not justified, by the hostile attitude assumed by many of the religious newspapers and influential ministers. While some of these came to their side, the majority of the leading clergymen in all denominations stood aloof. These had in their churches men allied to the South by business interests, or men who were bitterly prejudiced against abolition. They belonged to the great denominations, containing numerous Southern churches, and they foresaw disruption if they admitted this uncompromising element. Hence many clergymen of high standing were led to excuse or defend slavery. Most prominent among these were Dr. Nehemiah Adams of Boston, President Lord of Dartmouth College, New Hampshire, and Bishop Hopkins of Vermont, — all of whom defended slavery as right in itself, good for masters and slaves, and having the authority of the Bible in its favor. The President of Dartmouth College maintained, in two pamphlets published in Boston,[1] that

[1] *A Letter of Inquiry*, etc., by a Northern Presbyter, Boston, 1854. *A Northern Presbyter's Second Letter*, etc., by Nathan Lord, President of Dartmouth College, Boston, 1855.

slavery was a divine institution according to natural and revealed religion, not opposed to the law of love; that it was a wholesome institution, which ought to be extended; that it was right to do away with those political barriers which prevented it from going into Northern Territories and Northern States; that it was not slaveholders, but the opposers of slavery who deserved condemnation; and that he, President Lord, would himself cheerfully own slaves if it were convenient or necessary. John Henry Hopkins, Episcopal Bishop of the Diocese of Vermont, also published a book in 1857, in which he began by giving a false definition of slavery, making it only serfdom, and ignoring the chief evils of the system. He declared, in opposition to the facts in the case, that the condition of a slave was preferable to that of a free colored man, and in many respects superior to that of the white laborer in the Northern States. He denied that Christianity was opposed to slavery; and declared that "the color of the African race forms an insuperable obstacle to its elevation and civilization in this country." He even went so far as to think the African slave-trade, with all its horrors, was sent by the providence of God to bring the colored people to this country, where they might be taught Christianity, and then sent back in mass to Africa to civilize that continent. He seemed to forget that the Christian training they received was chiefly a knowledge of how to raise cotton and sugar, and that an excellent lady had recently been sent to prison for teaching them to read and write, this action of hers being made criminal by the laws of the Southern States. He defended the course of the South in this long struggle, declaring that the South was right and the North wrong. "The spirit of encroachment," said he, "is all on the side of the North," adding that the North was seeking to excite the slaves against their owners. This last assertion was not true, for the most ultra Abolitionists never passed a resolution or published a tract with any such purpose. But after having shown to his own satisfaction that the slave-trade was ordained by God, that slavery was a divine institution, and that the slaves were the happiest laboring population on earth, the Bishop proposed that they should all be bought by the United States, at a cost of about sixty millions of dollars annually, and be sent to Africa, with what object and for what purpose it was very difficult to discover.

To these two clerical defenders of slavery was joined Dr. Nehemiah Adams, a distinguished Orthodox divine of Boston, who has therefore a place in the history of this discussion. Going down to South Carolina in 1854, and spending three months there, he came back and published a book called *A South-Side View of Slavery*. The substance of it was that he had found slavery an exceedingly pleasant institution; the slaves very happy; and he had been told by many Southern gentlemen that they were not ill-treated, and had no wish to be free. Dr. Adams went on with the usual arguments to prove slavery a divine institution, reproved the Abolitionists, and added a few delicate hints of the advantage which might come from the revival of the slave-trade and the extension of slavery in the United States.

Is it wonderful that the Abolitionists, struggling against such odds in what they believed the cause of him who came to "preach deliverance to the captives," became rather angry and bitter when they saw themselves opposed by such influential teachers of Christian morals?

As if all these opponents were not enough, Mr. Garrison found himself obliged to resist and oppose a false friend, in the form of the American Colonization Society. This association was formed Dec. 31, 1816, and in 1821 purchased the territory in Western Africa known as Liberia. Of this society Henry Clay was the president; and one of its professed objects was to promote emancipation by providing a home in Africa to which freedmen could be sent. There were those who claimed that slavery in the United States could thus be abolished, by sending, at an enormous expense, the total annual increase of the colored people to Africa. Many intelligent people were so far misled as to encourage this absurd enterprise of sending the whole laboring population of the South from the country where their work was needed to one where it was not needed. The Colonization Society was encouraged by many Southern slaveholders as a means of getting rid of the free colored people among them, who were regarded as dangerous to the institution of slavery; and it was supported at the North on the opposite ground of being a method by which slavery might be gradually abolished. Mr. Garrison exposed the fallacy of this hope, and helped to undeceive those who had been misled by it.

It was in the year 1844 that Garrison and the Garrisonian Abolitionists took the ground of "No union with slaveholders." In their original declaration, adopted in 1833, they had plainly stated that the Constitution of the United States pledged the people of the free States to assist in putting down a slave-insurrection, and to return the fugitive to slavery; but ten years passed by before they deduced from this fact the logical necessity of the dissolution of the Union. Their argument now was that the Constitution of the United States was a pro-slavery document, and that every man who consented to vote or act under it was pledged thereby to support slavery whenever called on to do so. It was the Union of the North with the South which enabled the slaveholders to maintain the system and keep down the slaves. Therefore, by simply supporting the Union we were supporting slavery. The Union, therefore, ought to be dissolved, and this should be the object of all true Abolitionists.

Many, however, of the most earnest opposers of slavery hesitated at this point, and declined to follow Mr. Garrison. They contended that if there were pro-slavery clauses in the Constitution, its spirit and influence were antislavery, and that the organic basis of the Union was not the Constitution but the Declaration of Independence. They maintained that the laws of the free States were also unjust in many things, and commanded what was wrong, and that the only way to escape this kind of compromise with evil would be to go out of the world; but they added that we were thus

only passively connected with wrong-doing, and that when called upon to assist actively in returning fugitives, we had a right to refuse, under our allegiance to the higher law of Universal Right. They also said that in practice nothing was gained by the doctrine of disunion. Before you could induce the North to dissolve the Union, you must convince the majority of the people of the free States that slavery was a sin; and when you had convinced them of that they would not dissolve the Union, but by means of the Union would put an end to slavery. The slaveholders, always wise in their generation, desired to dissolve the Union, because they knew that when they were an independent slaveholding community they could better defend and protect this institution. Those who were opposed to slavery ought, therefore, it was said, to maintain the Union and not to dissolve it.

The result proved that this position was the true one. Slavery was finally abolished by the war which was begun in order to defend the Union. It was abolished not by those who wished to destroy the Union, but by those who were determined to preserve it. If the Garrisonians had succeeded in convincing the Northern people that it would be good and right to separate from the South and give up the Federal Union, there would have been no conflict. The Southern States would have been allowed to secede, and slavery would not have been abolished as a result of the war. It might have come to an end at last, in some other way; but certainly not then, and probably not for a long time.

Therefore, while the Garrisonian Abolitionists refused to vote or to take part in public affairs, political Antislavery parties were also formed by those who wished political action in the interests of freedom. The first of these was the Liberty Party, begun in New York in 1840, by Myron Holley, Alvan Stewart, and Gerrit Smith, who called a convention in Albany, at which James G. Birney, a Kentucky Abolitionist, was nominated for President. Casting only seven thousand votes in that Presidential campaign, at the next, in 1844, they had sixty thousand, and their vote probably defeated Mr. Clay, for whom, however, many of the party had voted in order to prevent the annexation of Texas, which soon followed Mr. Polk's election. Salmon P. Chase now became one of the chief leaders of this body; but this party was merged in 1848 in the Free-Soil party, which was formed by a secession of Antislavery voters from the Democrats and Whigs. The Democrats had nominated for President General Cass, who had openly opposed the Wilmot proviso, which excluded slavery from all territory acquired from Mexico. This caused, especially in New York, a secession from the Democratic party of men like William C. Bryant, Preston King, John A. Dix, and John Van Buren. They were called Barn-burners by their opponents, who charged them with wishing to destroy the Democratic party in order to rid themselves of its evils, as a man might burn his barn to rid himself of rats. On the nomination of General Taylor as the Whig candidate a similar but larger secession went from the Whig party. Those of Massachusetts met in convention at Worcester and adopted a platform, the

basis of which was the Wilmot proviso. Daniel Webster, who had declared the nomination of General Taylor "one not fit to be made," was visited in Boston by Henry Wilson and Charles Allen, members of the convention, and expressed his approval of the platform and his strong desire to see a political movement which would maintain the rights of the North; but he did not believe the new party would succeed in doing this. The South had ruled too long, he said, and had too much power to be defeated.

The Free-Soil State Convention of Massachusetts met in Boston, Sept. 6, 1848. Among others, Charles Sumner spoke on this occasion, and reported resolutions and an address to the people. This new party cast, at the Presidential election in November, two hundred and ninety thousand votes, with no hope of success, but simply to maintain a principle. Charles Sumner, who thus assisted in the formation of the Free-Soil party, was one of the noblest contributions made by Boston to the Antislavery cause. Born in Boston, Jan. 6, 1811; educated at the Boston Latin School; a student of law in Boston, after graduating at Harvard College, he was admitted to the Suffolk Bar in 1834. After his return from his tour in Europe he first took an active part in the Antislavery discussion in the matter of the "Creole." In 1841, some slaves taken on this American brig, bound from Virginia to New Orleans, freed themselves on the voyage and took the vessel to Nassau, where they were liberated. Daniel Webster, then Secretary of State, addressed a letter to our Minister at the Court of St. James, and claimed that the owners and officers of the vessel ought, by the comity of nations, to be assisted in maintaining their authority over the vessel and all on board, — in other words, that the English Government should arrest and return fugitives from slavery. Dr. Channing immediately wrote a pamphlet, in which he complained that Mr. Webster's letter "maintained morally unsound and pernicious doctrines fitted to deprave the public mind, and tending to commit the free States to the defence and support of slavery." He consulted Charles Sumner on some of the legal points before its publication. When Dr. Channing's position was attacked in the journals Sumner came at once to its defence, insisting on the purely local and exceptional character of slavery, — a theme which he expanded, ten years later, in his first Antislavery speech in the Senate, entitled "Freedom National, Slavery Sectional." He was at this time interested in the work of Garrison, subscribed for his paper, attended many of the Antislavery meetings, but declined joining their society, as he disapproved their methods. He could not admit that the Constitution of the United States was "a covenant with death and an agreement with hell," and believed that it was by means of the Union, and not outside of it, that slavery would be abolished. The event proved him to be right in this view. His first public appearance in Boston in the Antislavery conflict was in the Faneuil Hall meeting of November, 1845, called to oppose the admission of Texas into the Union. In 1846 he addressed the meeting in Faneuil Hall, on the occasion of the abduction of a fugitive who had escaped from New Orleans in a ship

belonging to John H. Pearson. The slave escaped from the vessel, was pursued and captured on shore, was forcibly held against law in the waters



CHARLES SUMNER.[1]

of Massachusetts, and sent back to slavery in the barque "Niagara." The meeting to protest against this inhuman proceeding was presided over by

[1] [This cut follows a photograph by Brady, taken about 1869. It has once before been engraved in *Every Saturday*, and was furnished by Sumner's friend and biographer, Edward L. Pierce, who kindly gives the following statement regarding other likenesses of Mr. Sumner: —

1. A crayon drawing by Eastman Johnson, made in 1846, held by the artist to be a good likeness, but others express a doubt. It is owned by Longfellow, and is engraved in Pierce's *Memoir*, vol. ii. 2. A large daguerreotype, by Southworth & Hawes, in 1853, owned by Mr. Pierce, and engraved in *Memoir*, vol. i. 3. A daguerreotype taken a few months later, owned by Mrs. W. S. Robinson. 4. A Crayon by W. W. Story, made for Lord Morpeth in 1854; now

John Quincy Adams, who, in a feeble and tremulous voice said: "Fifty years ago I attended a meeting in this place, over which Elbridge Gerry presided, who, apologizing for his age and infirmities, declared that if he had but one day to live he would have been present. That event was the taking out of an American frigate certain seamen by a British man-of-war." Mr. Adams said that he appeared in that hall for the same reason, and in defence of the same principle. Dr. Samuel G. Howe stated the facts. John A. Andrew, secretary of the meeting, offered the resolutions. Charles Sumner, Stephen C. Phillips, Wendell Phillips, and Theodore Parker spoke. On this occasion Andrew and Parker first publicly associated themselves with Sumner in Boston in a cause in which they stood by his side during so many years; and no three men have done more to illustrate the character

at Castle Howard; lithographed by S. W. Chandler before the drawing went to England; photographed at York since Sumner's death, and of this Mr. Pierce has a copy. 5. A portrait in oils by M. Wight, in 1856; given to the Boston Public Library in 1874; has been engraved. 6. A portrait by Wellman Morrison, painted in 1856; was given to Harvard College in 1874 by Oliver C. Everett, and is now in Gore Hall. 7. A photograph by Black in 1869; engraved in Sumner's *Works*. 8. Warren of Cambridge took several photographs about 1870–71; one standing, one sitting with a cane, one holding a French newspaper, and one reproduced in the *Memorial* published by the city in 1874. 9. A photograph by Allen & Rowell, the last ever taken, made late in 1873; is reproduced in the *Memorial* volume printed by the State in 1874, and has been engraved by the Treasury Department at Washington. The photographers have also issued it enlarged. 10. A portrait by Edgar Parker. 11. A portrait by William M. Hunt, not from life, but following Allen & Rowell's photograph. 12. A full-length portrait by ———, taken about 1873 for Hayti, of which there is a copy at Wormley's in Washington. 13. The earliest representation of any kind is Crawford's bust of him, taken in 1839, now in the Art Museum. See *Memoir*, ii. 94, 265. 14. Milmore's bust of him, now at the State House, is called good; but a repetition of it, which the State gave to George William Curtis, is better. 15. Various busts and statues of him were produced in plaster, etc., at the time of the competition for his bronze statue, erected in 1878 in the Public Garden, for which Thomas Ball's design was adopted.

The authoritative account of Sumner's life has been well begun by his friend and one of his literary executors, already referred to, Edward L. Pierce, who published in 1877 two volumes of *Memoir and Letters*, coming down to 1845, when Sumner was just on the threshold of his public career. This *Memoir* occasioned various reviews,—*Galaxy*, December, 1877; *Westminster Review*, January, 1878; *Edinburgh Review*, January, 1878; *North American Review*, 1878, by George F. Hoar; *International Review*, January, 1878, "Sumner's Place in History," by B. Perley Poore. Until this biography is completed, we must depend, apart from the general histories of his times, upon hasty compilations, occasioned by his death in 1874, like C. E. Lester's *Life and Public Services of Charles Sumner*, Phelps's *Life of Charles Sumner*, and Elias Nason's *Life and Times of Charles Sumner*. More valuable are Carl Schurz's eulogy before the City Government in Boston, making part of a *Memorial* published by the City; James Freeman Clarke's paper in his *Memorial and Biographical Sketches*; recollections by his secretary, A. B. Johnson, published in *Scribner's Monthly*, vols. viii.–x.; and a eulogy by G. W. Curtis before the State authorities, printed in a *Memorial* by the State. The speeches occasioned by his death, delivered in Congress, are preserved in a *Memorial* issued by the two Houses. The colored representative from South Carolina, R. B. Elliot, delivered an oration before the colored citizens of Boston in Faneuil Hall, which is also the chief feature of another *Memorial* volume. Mr. Pierce also printed "A Senator's Fidelity Vindicated" in the *North American Review*, July, 1878. There are letters of his, during his public life, in Weiss's *Theodore Parker*. Laugel treats of him in his *Grandes Figures Historiques*. Mrs. M. C. Ames, in her *Outlines of Men*, etc., gives an account of his home. He left his library and collection of autographs to Harvard College Library, and an account of this *Sumner Collection* has been printed by that Library. Theodore Parker formed a scrap-book of newspaper-cuttings concerning Sumner, and this is in the Public Library, together with a special collection of newspapers taking note of his death, and other memorials of him. A view of the monument over Sumner's grave at Mount Auburn is given in the *Harvard Register*, July, 1881. — Ed.]

of Boston in its devotion to human liberty than they. Of Andrew we shall shortly have occasion to speak; but we must now briefly describe the Antislavery work done in Boston by Theodore Parker.

Theodore Parker was not born in Boston, but in Lexington, Mass., in 1810. His veins were filled with the blood of Puritans and Revolutionary patriots. An earnest student, a great scholar, devoted, like Dr. Channing, to ideas, — like Dr. Channing he laid aside his dearest literary projects to obey the call of conscience and divine duty. That call led him to give a large part of his time, thought, energy, and heart to the Abolition movement. He first began to take a public part in it in 1845, and from that time till his death he was always in the front ranks of the Antislavery work. Intimate and familiar with Garrison, Wendell Phillips, and their body, a frequent speaker on their platform, he was equally intimate with the leaders of the political Antislavery parties. He was in correspondence with Charles Sumner, John P. Hale, Salmon P. Chase, James G. Birney, Horace Mann, John G. Palfrey, William H. Seward, Gerrit Smith. After coming to Boston, in 1845, he preached every Sunday to great audiences in the Melodeon and Music Hall; and in his sermons discussed with fiery ardor every event bearing on the great topics of Slavery and Freedom. Thus he spoke of the annexation of Texas, the rendition of fugitive slaves, the war with Mexico, and all the assaults of the slave-power on the cause of human liberty. He spoke repeatedly in Faneuil Hall; published many pamphlets, essays, speeches, and sermons; lectured on slavery through all the free States, and once in Delaware; aided the fugitives to escape, and sheltered them in his house; was a member of the vigilance committees; and wrote many letters to public men concerning their duties in this relation. He did not agree with Garrison in his opposition to the Union; he regarded the Union as an instrument by which slavery would be abolished; and in this he showed his rare sagacity. Thus, from 1845 until his fatal attack in 1859, he was a power in Boston to move public opinion in opposition to slavery, and to bear aloft the standard of human freedom.

During all this struggle fugitives from slavery were constantly arriving from the South, and telling the same tale of their sufferings from slavery, and their various methods of escaping. One man had been packed in a box, and so brought through by the freight company as goods. He afterward went by the name of Box Brown, and told his thrilling tale on many an Antislavery platform. Another got under the guards of a Southern steamer bound for Philadelphia, and clung for many hours to the vessel, though every heavy roll buried him under the sea. Ellen Craft, a light mulatto woman, escaped disguised as a young Southern planter, bringing her husband with her in the character of her body servant. Father Henson, a man of much talent and character, told a long tale of his trials and adventures in escaping from Kentucky. These personal narrations thrilled the audiences, and brought home to them the real horrors and miseries of the system. But among those nurtured into eloquence by wrong, none equalled Frederick Douglass. Men

listened with wonder to a speaker, of the first class of orators, who had been born and raised a slave; and the old argument that the slaves were



Theodore Parker.[1]

not qualified for freedom seemed ridiculous wherever his clear, strong arguments and his powerful appeals were heard.

[1] [This likeness of Theodore Parker follows a photograph kindly loaned by Wendell Phillips, Esq., and copied from one taken for Miss Hunt about 1856 or 1857. Miss Caroline C. Thayer owns the same on porcelain, in which the expression is softer and more satisfactory. By the will of Mrs. Parker, who is recently deceased, Story's bust and Cheney's crayon of Parker have come to the Public Library. This bust is engraved in vol. ii. of Weiss's *Life of Parker*. Milmore's bust, much liked by Parker's friends, is still in the artist's studio. The authoritative account is the *Life and Correspondence of Theodore Parker*, issued by John Weiss in 1864, in two volumes. A condensed narrative is a review of this in the *North American Review*, April, 1859, by O. B. Frothingham, who in 1874 published his *Theodore Parker: A Biography*, which may be supplemented by the chapter on "Theodore Parker, the Preacher," in Frothingham's *Transcendentalism in New England*. Mr. Frothingham also supplied an introduction, and Miss H. E. Stevenson a biographical sketch, to Parker's *Discourse on Matters Pertaining to Religion*, 1876. A little book, *The Life and Teachings of Theodore Parker*, by Peter Dean, was published in London in 1877, where also had been published, in 1865, A. Réville's *Life and Writings of Parker*, a trans-

Thus the years passed, the slave-power growing stronger in political influence, carrying one measure after another, bending to its interest the leading politicians of both parties. At the same time the moral power of the Antislavery movement increased with still greater rapidity. A small body in Congress resisted the encroachments of the South; among them was John G. Palfrey, who, in the Thirtieth Congress, delivered a speech of great power and beauty, in which he showed the growth of the pro-slavery influence, which he was the first to call the slave-power. He ended by saying: "If the slaveholders insist that Union and Slavery cannot live together, they may be taken at their own word; but it is the Union that must stand." It was on this occasion that John Quincy Adams exclaimed, "Thank God! the seal is broken." In this same debate Horace Mann made a powerful argument against the admission of slavery into the Territories; he spoke forcibly on the effect of slavery in destroying manliness and energy of character, and said: "There are in this land three million Casper Hausers."

At last, in 1850, an effort was made by the leaders of the two great parties, the Whigs and Democrats, to put an end to this agitation, and silence discussion by passing a series of measures in Congress, embodied in what was called the Compromise Bill. The question which had to be settled was the condition to be assigned to the territory gained by the war with Mexico. According to the Wilmot Proviso, it was to be all free. This the slave-power bitterly opposed. In January, 1850, Henry Clay introduced his compromise measure, which proposed to admit California as a State and New Mexico as a Territory, without applying the Wilmot Proviso to either; refusing to abolish slavery in the District of Columbia, but prohibiting the slave-trade there; allowing the trade in slaves between the States, and passing a more stringent fugitive-slave law. In the debate which followed, Mr. Clay declared that "no earthly power would induce him to introduce slavery where it did not exist."

lation of a book issued in Paris the same year. This writer had printed "Un Reformateur Américain" in the *Revue des Deux Mondes*, Oct. 1, 1861.

Parker's own works are largely illustrative of his intellectual development, particularly his *Experiences as a Minister, with an Account of his Early Life*, 1859, contained also in the appendix of Weiss's *Life* of him. See the autobiographic pieces in the London edition of his works (1876), xii. His strong feelings came out emphatically in his *Discourse on the Death of Daniel Webster*, 1852, and in his *Trial for the "Misdemeanor" of a Speech, in Faneuil Hall, against Kidnapping, April 3, 1865, with His Defence*. There is in the Public Library a scrap-book, formed and annotated by himself, containing newspaper cuttings relating to his indictment for obstructing the United States Marshal at the time of the rendition of Burns.

On his death various memorial sermons were published by Boston ministers, — W. R. Alger, C. A. Bartol, J. F. Clarke, G. H. Hepworth, etc. See also Mr. Clarke's tribute in his *Memorial and Biographical Sketches*. Colonel T. W. Higginson paid one at the time in the *Atlantic Monthly*, 1860. He has frequently been the subject of commendation and animadversion in the periodical press, —*Bibliotheca Sacra*, January, 1861, and April, 1869; *Christian Examiner*, January, 1864, by J. H. Allen, and July, 1864, by D. A. Wasson; *New Englander*, ii. and iii., by Noah Porter; *Contemporary Review*, 1866, by Professor Cheetham; *Fortnightly Review*, 1867, by M. D. Conway. Numerous other references will be found in Allibone's *Dictionary*. A discourse by Samuel Longfellow was delivered at the dedication of the Parker Memorial Meeting-house in Boston, Sept. 21, 1873, and is printed in a pamphlet of the *Dedicatory Services*. — Ed.]

It was at this time that Daniel Webster made his famous Seventh-of-March Speech, in which he opposed the exclusion of slavery from the Territories by law, and accepted the Fugitive-slave law. This speech caused the greatest sadness at the North among those who had looked to Daniel Webster as a tower of strength against the encroachments of the slave-power. Down to the very day when this speech was made his intimate political friends in Boston announced that Webster was about to make a great speech in opposition to the plans of the slaveholders. He had already claimed the Wilmot Proviso as "his thunder;" he had consulted with Joshua Giddings and Thaddeus Stevens in regard to his course. They had been led to believe that he would put himself at the head of those who opposed the extension of slavery. He now declared, however, that he was willing to divide Texas into four slave States; he said that he was ready to support the new fugitive-slave law with all its provisions. This speech of Webster was a great blow to the Antislavery cause. Whittier wrote concerning it his poem called "Ichabod." Men at the North regarded it, justly or otherwise, as a bid for the Presidency. But Mr. Webster's influence was still so great that a large and influential body of his friends in Boston, after a little hesitation, expressed their approbation of his course. Many, however, refused to follow him. Joseph T. Buckingham, in the Massachusetts Legislature, moved to incorporate in a series of resolutions the words formerly spoken by Mr. Webster, in which he had declared that the opposition of Massachusetts to the extension of slavery was universal, and that they would "oppose such extension in all places, at all times, and under all circumstances, against all inducements, all combinations, all compromises."

But the compromises passed through Congress and became a law, and both the great parties decided to put down all slavery agitation; there was to be no more discussion of the subject in Congress or elsewhere. But an event soon occurred which dispelled this pleasing illusion. Three months after Daniel Webster's speech, and before the Compromise measures had finally gone through Congress, Harriet Beecher Stowe began the story of "Uncle Tom's Cabin" in the *National Era*, published in Washington. In 1852 *Uncle Tom's Cabin* was published in Boston in book form, and is thus a Boston book. In eight weeks the sale in the United States reached a hundred thousand copies; in 1856 over three hundred thousand copies had been sold in the United States, and more than a million in England. It was translated into every language of Europe; also into Arabic, Chinese, and Japanese.[1] Thus the whole world was reading about slavery in the United States, and discussing it.

Two or three fugitives from slavery were arrested in Boston, and two, Simms and Burns, surrendered by the United States Commissioners, were

[1] [There are in the Public Library of all these translations of *Uncle Tom's Cabin* as many as could be procured a few years ago, the *Catalogue* of the British Museum affording the titles to be searched for. Since the collection was made, Mr. George Bullen, the keeper of the printed books in the Museum, has furnished a full bibliographical list of such versions to a new edition of the novel published in this city. —Ed.]

taken back into slavery; but the trifling advantages gained by slavery from such renditions were vastly outweighed by the indignation against the slave-power, and all its abettors, occasioned by these transactions. In all ages and nations it had been held odious to return fugitives into the hands of their oppressors. The history of ancient and modern times teemed with this sentiment. George S. Hillard was a United States Commissioner, and as such would have been bound to surrender fugitives when brought before him in accordance with the law; but his wife, Susan Hillard, a noble woman, devoted to generous deeds, sheltered fugitives under their roof. On the day of the rendition of Burns the streets through which he was to pass were draped in black, and immense crowds filled Court Street, State Street, and Washington Street; the military who guarded him were received with loud shouts as "Kidnappers! kidnappers!" The tension was so extreme that there seemed at one moment imminent danger of a tumult which would have cost many lives. The Fugitive-slave law was not only odious in itself, but believed to be unconstitutional in its provisions. The United States Constitution had provided that "no person shall be deprived of his liberty without due process of law," and that "in all suits at common law, where the value in controversy shall exceed twenty dollars, the right of trial by jury shall be preserved." But Simms and Burns were deprived of their liberty without seeing either judge or jury. All the old guarantees of human liberty seemed to be removed by this law; and those who took part in passing it or executing it, from Daniel Webster and Millard Fillmore down, lost their political position from that hour.

The violence of the slave-power, and its disregard for the rights of the free States, caused many persons to accustom themselves to the thought that sooner or later force must be met by force. Others, believing that to send a man into slavery was a violation of the law of God, refused to permit the Fugitive-slave law to be enforced if it were possible to prevent it. They held themselves justified in rescuing a slave from his oppressor at any risk. Loving peace well, they loved justice more. This sentiment showed itself in Boston in the Shadrach rescue, the Burns riot, the formation of the vigilance committee, and in contributions to enable the oppressed Free-State emigrants to Kansas to defend themselves against the Missouri invaders.

In February, 1851, Shadrach, a colored waiter at the Cornhill Coffee House in Boston, was arrested as a fugitive from slavery under a warrant issued by George T. Curtis, United States Commissioner. After a preliminary hearing the case was adjourned; and at this moment a body of colored men seized the prisoner, rescued him from the officers, and sent him away to Canada. Washington was filled with excitement; the President issued a proclamation; Congress was deeply moved. Several persons were tried in Boston for assisting in the rescue, but none were convicted.

A few months later, Thomas M. Simms was sent into slavery by the same commissioner. It was on this occasion that the Court House was

surrounded with chains by the United States Marshal, and the judges of the Supreme Court of Massachusetts were obliged to stoop under this symbol of the slaveholders' supremacy in order to reach their tribunals of justice. This was the hour of the deepest humiliation in Massachusetts; but it stirred the souls of many a son of Boston with the purpose of determined resistance to this overbearing iniquity.

This feeling showed itself on the next occasion when the Fugitive-slave law was enforced in Boston, by the arrest of Anthony Burns, under a warrant issued by Edward G. Loring. Meetings were held in Faneuil Hall and elsewhere in Boston, at which the most determined speeches were made by Samuel G. Howe, George R. Russell, Francis W. Bird, Thomas W. Higginson, Wendell Phillips, Theodore Parker, and others. Meantime a plan for the rescue of Burns had been formed by Albert G. Browne, John L. Swift, T. W. Higginson, and Seth Webb, Jr.; but it failed for want of a full understanding between those engaged. Higginson, Webb, Lewis Hayden, and a few companions forced their way into the Court House, but failed of their purpose. Indictments were found against Parker, Phillips, Higginson, and one or two more. They were defended by John P. Hale, Charles M. Ellis, William L. Burt, John A. Andrew, and Henry F. Durant. The indictment was quashed, and the cases dismissed.

It is not necessary to describe the emotion produced by the murderous assault on Charles Sumner by Preston Brooks of South Carolina. This took place in the Senate Chamber, May 22, 1856. The cause of this brutal attack was Sumner's speech on "The Crime against Kansas." In this he had described the terrible wrong against freedom which the slave-power had committed in that territory. Unable to reply to his arguments, the slaveholders answered by blows; and during four years his vacant chair in the Senate testified in silence against this outrage. But he was spared to return to uphold the arms of Abraham Lincoln during the Rebellion, to see the end of slavery, and at last to be followed to his grave with the grateful tears of vast multitudes in his own loved city of Boston.

One of the warmest friends of Sumner, and one who stood by him faithfully during his whole Antislavery career, was Dr. Samuel Gridley Howe. In him there seemed to reappear in New England the romance and chivalry of the Middle Ages. Born in Boston, a pupil in the Latin School, a student of medicine here, he went to Greece to assist in its effort for independence, when he was but just of age; and afterward took part in the Polish and French revolutionary struggles. Long after, amid his tender labors for the blind, the deaf and dumb, the idiots, and other children of sorrow, the Abolition movement appealed equally to his humanity and his chivalry. Especially he was deeply interested in the movement for making Kansas a free State. At his office on Bromfield Street you would meet the men engaged in organizing that emigration to Kansas which, after years of persecution and trial, succeeded in saving it from slavery. There was to be found that most generous of men, — George L. Stearns, — who, after giving

thousands of dollars to furnish the Kansas emigrants with clothing, provisions, and Sharpe's rifles, is said to have given to John Brown, "first and last, more than ten thousand dollars in money and arms." In that office the present writer met and talked with Brown himself, just before his movement on Harper's Ferry, and heard from his own lips the general plan, though not the place or time, of his proposed assault on Southern slavery.[1]

The struggle for freedom in Kansas excited great interest through New England, and Boston again became the centre of operation, where this interest was organized into activity. Money was raised to assist the Free-State emigrants and supply them with all necessary help. The men raised funds to furnish them with Sharpe's rifles and ammunition; the women collected clothing and money for food. In numberless towns small societies were organized for this purpose, and the supplies were sent to Boston to be forwarded to Kansas by a committee, of which Mrs. Samuel Cabot, Jr., was the efficient and admirable head. When John Brown, of Ossawattomie, needed money, he came to Boston and obtained it. When taken prisoner and about to be tried, John Albion Andrew raised for his defence a sufficient sum to obtain for him the best legal counsel. When he died in Virginia, a martyr for freedom, a large public meeting was held in Boston to obtain aid for his wife and surviving children. Thus Boston was faithful to the end, and down to the beginning of the Civil War was the recognized centre of all Antislavery movements, both moral and political.

When the Civil War began in 1861, John Albion Andrew[2] had been chosen Governor of the State of Massachusetts. He had been long known as an Antislavery man, and as a leading member of the Republican party; but few foresaw the ability he would display in his trying position, or how easily he would rise to its difficulties. With what foresight, with what judgment,

[1] See the speeches of Colonel Thomas Wentworth Higginson and others, in the *Memoir of Samuel Gridley Howe*, by Julia Ward Howe: Boston, 1876.

[2] [A statue of Governor Andrew stands in Doric Hall in the State House. It is the work of Thomas Ball, and a published volume describes the services at the unveiling. Another statue, by Thomas R. Gould, was erected over his grave in the Hingham Cemetery in 1875, when it was publicly dedicated, October 8, with an address by Horace Binney Sargent. A memorial volume, containing the exercises of the dedication, was compiled by Luther Stevenson, Jr., and published in 1878, giving views of the statue, which is in marble. The materials for his official life are contained in more than thirty thousand pages of his correspondence as Governor, preserved at the State House, and in about five thousand pages of his private correspondence. He sent during his five years of service nearly one hundred messages to the Legislature. Edwin P. Whipple delivered the address at the commemoration services of the city, and it is contained in his *Success and Its Conditions*. His military secretary, Albert G. Browne, Jr., prepared a sketch of his life, which, having served as an article in the *North American Review*, January, 1868, was published, somewhat expanded, as *The Official Life of John A. Andrew*, 1868. This volume also contained his valedictory address on leaving the governorship. His pastor, James Freeman Clarke, printed a sketch in *Harper's Monthly*, February, 1868, afterward included in his *Memorial and Biographical Sketches*. Peleg W. Chandler supplied a memoir, printed in the *Mass. Hist. Soc. Proc.*, April, 1880. This was later issued separately, with the addition of personal reminiscences and with two of the Governor's literary addresses, never before printed. His descent is traced in the *N. E. Hist. and Genealog. Reg.*, January, 1869. — Ed.]

with what untiring devotion to his country's needs, with what courage to meet every danger, his work was done, all may read in the history of that terrible struggle. As Boston was the leader in the war for Independence, under the guidance of Sam Adams and his companions, so it was again the leader of the North in the war for Union and Freedom, under the guidance of John Albion Andrew. Just to all his opponents, with no self-seeking, with imperturbable sweetness of temper, though capable of a fiery indignation against wrong-doing, he disarmed opposition at home, and united Massachusetts in an unbroken phalanx against secession. William Lloyd Garrison, John Albion Andrew, Charles Sumner, and other of the Boston leaders in this struggle were fortunate beyond most reformers in living to see the work fully accomplished to which they had given their lives. Some indeed, like Theodore Parker, Horace Mann, and Ellis Gray Loring, "died without the sight;" but many, like Garrison, Sumner, Phillips, Sewall, Andrew, Oliver Johnson, Maria Chapman, Lydia Maria Child, and Lucretia Mott, lived to see the consummation of their hopes in the advent of universal freedom; they lived to see a Republic trodden by no foot which was not free. More than four millions of human beings had been changed from slaves to freemen, had become American citizens, and had entered on an upward career of improvement.[1]



Of the war itself, of which this was the result, we have nothing to say here. A great number of Boston young men went to hardship, peril, and death, from their interest in this cause. Those who returned had their reward in knowing that they had assisted in the triumph of human liberty; those who fell have made the place where they sleep hallowed ground forever.

"Their memory wraps the dusky mountain;
Their spirit sparkles in the fountain:
The meanest rill, the mightiest river,
Rolls mingling with their fame forever!"



[1] [A group symbolic of Emancipation, — affording a portrait statue of Abraham Lincoln, representing him as freeing a slave, cast in bronze at Munich, designed by Thomas Ball, in 1874, and presented to the city by Moses Kimball, — was erected in 1879 in Park Square, when Frederick O. Prince, the mayor of the city, delivered a dedicatory oration, December 6. (*City Document* No. 126, of 1879, describes it and the ceremonies.) — Ed.]

CHAPTER VII.

THE CONGREGATIONAL (TRINITARIAN) CHURCHES OF BOSTON SINCE 1780.

BY THE REV. INCREASE N. TARBOX, D.D.

THIS chapter presents, in a brief and comprehensive form, the history of those Congregational churches of Boston which, since the American Revolution, have kept to the Trinitarian belief. To keep within the limited space it will be needful to avoid minuter details, and confine ourselves strictly to a general or outline view.

The population of the town of Boston in 1775 was, according to the common estimate, not far from 17,000. Her Congregational churches at that time were eleven in number, named as follows, with the dates of their organization: —

First Church	Aug. 23, 1630.	Federal-Street Church	Nov. 15, 1727.
Second Church	June 5, 1650.	Hollis-Street Church	Nov. 14, 1732.
Old South Church	May 12, 1669.	West (Lynde Street) Church	Jan. 3, 1737.
Brattle-Street Church	Dec. 12, 1699.	Samuel Mather Church	May 29, 1742.
New North Church	May 5, 1714.	School-Street Church	Feb. 17, 1748.
New South Church	Nov. 22, 1719.		

The Federal-Street Church, organized in 1727, was originally Presbyterian, but is placed in the above list because it eventually became Congregational. The two churches standing last upon the list ceased to exist soon after the close of the war. They were both peculiar in their origin, though in ways quite different. They were organized under such conditions that their life and fortunes were made to be largely dependent upon the two men who filled their pulpits. As it happened, these two men had, each of them, a long pastorate. But upon the death of the Rev. Andrew Croswell, minister of the School-Street Church, April 12, 1785, and of Dr. Samuel Mather, June 27, 1785, these two organizations were suspended, and their membership was merged in the neighboring churches. The other churches named above continue for the most part until the present day.

Up to the Revolution the strength of the Boston population was Puritan, after the order of the first founders, with only a small admixture of antagonistic elements. The church development had been, therefore, chiefly

Congregational. Nevertheless, in addition to the churches named above, there were at that period three Episcopal churches, — King's Chapel, 1686; Christ Church, 1723; and Trinity, 1728. There were also two Baptist churches, — the First, 1665; and the Second (now known as Warren Avenue), 1743. One Methodist church had been established, 1771; and one Quaker, 1694.

It was long ago said that "Boston was the paradise of ministers." During the one hundred and forty-five years preceding the Revolution, in nothing had her people taken greater delight than in their learned and able divines, and their stately Sabbath assemblies. Favored at the beginning in the possession of John Wilson and John Cotton, associate ministers of the First Church, and meanwhile, as her churches multiplied, having had her choice among the graduates of the college near at hand, her ministry had been her pride and boast. Her meeting-houses, though built in the simplicity of the ancient days, with more of strength than beauty, were yet structures of dignity, on which the thought and the wealth of the town had been freely expended. Mr. Cotton had done more, perhaps, than any other man, to give shape to the early Congregationalism of New England, and to the forms and usages of her public worship. That system which he helped to build, and which soon after was embodied in the Cambridge Platform of 1648, was something grand, stately, governmental; but it was not Congregationalism, as we now understand the meaning of that word. It was a system of high forms and graded dignities, in which the bench of elders, — the teaching, the pastoral, and the ruling elders, — held all the real power; while to the common members was given the Christian privilege of obeying their elders in the Lord. What we now regard as vital to the true idea of a Congregational Church, — the equality of all voting members in matters of government and order, making the organization a simple and strict democracy — this was something known among the Pilgrims at Plymouth from the outset, but was practically unknown in the Massachusetts Bay through all those early years. But whatever the system of church government prevailing in Boston before the Revolution, no one can doubt that her churches were to her as the apple of her eye.

The Thursday, or fifth-day, Lecture was suspended for several months during the time of the siege. Snow, in his *History of Boston*, says: "Thursday lecture had been continued by Dr. Andrew Eliot until about the 23d of December, and was renewed immediately after the evacuation of the town, on the 28th of March, when Washington attended." This weekly lecture continued, as an institution, until after the middle of the present century. Some eight or ten thousand lectures must have been delivered in the town during the two hundred years while the custom lasted. Now and then one of more than usual interest and importance was published and preserved. Most of them filled their places from year to year, and from age to age, like the regular meals of a household, which furnish strength and vigor for the passing days, and are forgotten.

In glancing back it will be seen "that from the founding of the First Church in 1630, down to the organization of the School-Street Church in 1748, no long period had passed without adding a new church to the list. The longest interval was that of thirty years, between the formation of the Old South in 1669 and Brattle Street in 1699. In general a new church appeared upon the field on an average of about ten years. This being so, the contrast between the times going before 1748 and those following after is very remarkable. On the old territory of Boston no new Congregational Church appeared from the year 1748 down to the organization of Park-Street Church in 1809; while, as we have seen, two of the churches which existed in 1748 became extinct in 1785. In this long period of sixty-one years not only was there no gain, but an absolute loss.

The last half of the last century and the early years of the present must be regarded as a period peculiarly unfavorable to religious growth and prosperity in New England. We might, in this connection, speak of the disastrous results of the long-continued union of Church and State in our early New England history, and other kindred causes. But leaving these aside, there are certain open and obvious facts looking in the same general direction, which deserve to be brought into special notice.

For fifty years and more from the middle of the last century the minds of men in this country were peculiarly absorbed by questions of politics and war. First came the "French and Indian War," so-called, which made a very heavy draft upon the families and the property of New England. Hardly had this passed, when the fierce agitations between this and the mother country began. This was a strife which year by year waxed hotter and hotter, until it culminated in the eight years' struggle of the Revolution. After this war closed, came up the long and tedious debates touching the formation of the government and the provisions of the federal constitution. To aggravate the case, and render matters connected with religion still worse, our friendly alliance with France during the years of the Revolution had made our people very familiar with French ideas of life, here and hereafter. Nothing could be more at variance with the old New England faith than this light, airy, unthinking philosophy. At the close of the last century French infidelity had become quite current in New England, especially among the young men. And nowhere was this more common than among the young men in our colleges, — advanced thinkers, as they thought themselves to be, and aspiring to be leaders of public opinion. Whether we have here given the true causes or not, it must be admitted that New England was never at a lower point, religiously, as seen in her public and in her private life, than in the earliest years of the present century.

Thus far our attention has been directed to Boston, as its territory was known and bounded in the last century. But it is of course proper that the Boston of to-day should be comprehended and exhibited. To this end it is needful that we turn back again for a moment, and enumerate the

Congregational churches existing one hundred years ago on the territory recently brought within the city limits. These churches are five in number, namely: —

First Church in Roxbury	July, 1632.
First Church in Charlestown	Nov. 2, 1632.
First Church in Dorchester	Aug. 23, 1636.
Second Church in Roxbury (West Roxbury)	Nov. 2, 1712.
Third Church in Roxbury (Jamaica Plain)	Dec. 11, 1770.

These five, added to the eleven already enumerated, show the existence of sixteen Congregational churches, in 1780, upon the territory now embraced within the city of Boston. In some lists the First Church in Brighton is made to date from 1730. But we reckon the year of the formation of the Old Brighton Church to be 1783. Brighton was anciently a part of Cambridge, and was called Little Cambridge. A preaching service, more or less irregular, had been maintained at Little Cambridge from 1730 onward. But the real organization of the church did not take place till 1783, and we date from that organic act, and not from the early movements looking in that direction.

Of the sixteen churches named above, which were in active existence one hundred years ago upon the present Boston soil, all but two in the early years of the present century became known as Unitarian. The two remaining Trinitarian were the First Church in Charlestown and the Old South. As the Unitarian churches of the city will be presented in a separate chapter, we will not attempt farther to follow their fortunes, but will give our attention to the two above-mentioned, and those of like faith which have come into existence during the present century.

After that long period of dulness and decline of which we have spoken, at length came the time when the religious life of New England set forward again under new and more favorable auspices. Some of the evils and hindrances of the former years had worked themselves out to their full end, and had disappeared. That scheme of church-membership introduced by the Synod of 1662, and known as the Half-way Covenant, had at length been abandoned. The ruling elders, who figured so prominently in the early generations, had taken their departure. The aristocratic features of the Cambridge Platform, giving such undue power in the government of the churches to the ministers, had lost their vitality. The union of the Church with the State was rapidly drawing to a close. The churches, both in city and country, were losing some of their formal dignity and growing more and more into the pattern of the New Testament simplicities. The exclusiveness of the former days had gone by; and a fair and open field was presented to churches of other denominations, giving them substantially the same rights and privileges which had before been reserved for churches of the standing order. In due time came the full inauguration of the principle that religion should be free, — that no person should be taxed for any church except at his own pleasure. Changes so radical as these seemed to

many of the conservative men of fifty and sixty years ago the giving up of all that New England had held most dear. But, looking back from the present, few will deny that our religious condition is far more sound and healthful in consequence of these changes. This revolution was a growth from within, rather than a measure forced upon the churches from without. There never was a time when the churches of the standing order in New England were forced by outside majorities to change their early policy; they yielded rather to the silent pressure of their own underlying principles. Step by step they advanced logically toward greater liberty and toleration.

With the opening years of the present century other elements, of a different type, came into the church life of New England. Then began that great migratory movement, by which the pent-up population of the Atlantic slopes and the gathering hosts of the Old World were to be distributed across this broad continent. A missionary field of the most majestic proportions opened before the churches of every name and order. Coincident with this came the Christian impulse to send the blessings of the gospel far abroad to the nations sitting in darkness. The thoughts of men and women were thus turned away from themselves and from the little worlds in which they personally moved to the broad land which God had given them for an inheritance, and to a wide and waiting world appealing to their Christian sympathies. The missionary work at home and abroad done by this and by other lands distinguishes, to an eminent degree, the Christianity of the present century from the centuries that went before. There is now among the churches of the New England type less of form and ceremony, less of dignity and state, less of dogmatic controversy than in the generations past; but there is, let us hope, more of the spirit of that great Teacher and Master who went about doing good. Looking at things in a certain way, it is easy to conclude that men and women were more religious formerly than now. There was a far more enforced conformity to religious observances; but when we remember that religion is a thing of the heart, and not of the outward form, and that nothing can be truly genuine and worthy in this respect which does not spring naturally out of a free and willing mind, we may find some evidence that the real piety of this generation is as good as that of the past.

Early in the present century began the formation of Sunday-schools among the churches of this country, — an enterprise which has already grown into vast proportions. It has called out the benevolence and the working power of our churches to a very great degree. From year to year this enterprise takes on new forms and varieties and methods of work; but never, perhaps, has the range of its activity been larger or more healthy than at present. All these things indicate religious activity, if not religious thought. The century in which we are living has witnessed an advance in almost every department of life truly marvellous; and we believe that the religious progress during this period will prove as truly great as the revolution wrought in things outward and material.

Going back then once more to the beginning of the century, and setting out with the two churches which had come over from the previous generations, we find that within the limits of the present city of Boston forty-one Congregational churches have meanwhile sprung into existence. Of these, twenty-six were on the ancient territory of Boston, and fifteen were in the several districts which have lately been added to the city. These are as follows, taking first those on the old territory: —

Park Street, 1809; Union, 1822; Phillips, 1823; Green Street, 1823; Bowdoin, 1825; Salem Street, 1827; Berkeley, 1827; Mariners, 1830; Central, 1835; Maverick, 1836; Free Church, 1836; Garden Street, 1840; Mount Vernon, 1842; Messiah, 1844; Church of the Pilgrims, 1844; Leyden, 1844; Payson, 1845; Shawmut, 1845; Edwards, 1849; Church of the Unity, 1857; Springfield Street, 1860; Oak Place, 1860; E Street, 1860; Chambers Street, 1861; Salem and Mariners, 1866; Olivet, 1876.

Those in the new districts are as follows: —

Second Church, Dorchester, 1808; Brighton, 1827; Village Church, Dorchester, 1829; Winthrop, Charlestown, 1833; Eliot, Roxbury, 1834; South Evan., West Roxbury, 1835; Bethesda, Charlestown, 1847; Central, Jamaica Plain, 1853; Immanuel, Roxbury, 1857; Trinity, Neponset, 1859; Pilgrim, Dorchester, 1862; Highland, Roxbury, 1869; Walnut Avenue, Roxbury, 1870; Church of Hollanders, Roxbury, 1873; Boylston, Jamaica Plain, 1879.

In making a brief reference to the men who have occupied the pulpits of these churches during the century, we shall be obliged to confine our notices to some of the more conspicuous, who have already passed away. In making our selection we shall choose indiscriminately from the ancient Boston, and from those portions recently brought within the city limits.

In 1779, almost at the beginning of the period contemplated in this chapter, the Rev. Dr. Joseph Eckley was ordained pastor of the Old South Church. He was a native of London, England, and a graduate from the College of New Jersey. His ministry continued thirty-two years, until his death in 1811. It was eminently a transition period among the churches of Boston, and Dr. Eckley to some degree sympathized with the changes going forward, though not to such an extent as to leave his old theological associations. He was a man of refined manners and good culture, who fulfilled his ministry in a troubled and revolutionary period.



In the year 1808 the Rev. Joshua Huntington was settled as his colleague. He was a man greatly beloved and honored, but his ministry was cut short in 1819 by his untimely death, at the age of thirty-four.

The Rev. Jedidiah Morse, D.D., was settled over the First Church of Charlestown in 1789, and continued in office until 1820, when he resigned. He was one of the marked men of his generation, distinguished by his pulpit talents and his power as a writer upon religious and doctrinal topics.

He has been known also as the father of American geography, and was deeply interested in all matters scientific and historical. For several years he was the editor of the *Panoplist*, and was prominently connected with the founding of the Andover Theological Seminary. Great as he was in himself, he was still more distinguished in his sons, who have filled a high place in journalism, and in the records of great inventions. He was a member of the Massachusetts Historical Society, and of other learned bodies.

The Rev. Edward Dorr Griffin, D.D., the first pastor of Park-Street Church, professor of rhetoric in Andover Theological Seminary, and president of Williams College, impressed the men of his generation as a preacher of solid power and commanding eloquence. His stay in Boston was brief. His longest term of office was in the presidency of Williams College, where he remained from 1821 to 1836. He was among the leading pulpit orators of his time in New England.



The Rev. John Codman, D.D., first pastor of the Second Church in Dorchester, remained in office thirty-nine years, till his death. The son of a wealthy Boston merchant, he enjoyed more than the usual opportunities for education, both at home and abroad. Without any thought or forecast at the time of his settlement as to what would happen, it fell to his lot to open that great strife, in the early years of the present century, whereby a separation took place between the Congregational churches since known as Unitarian and those that adhered to the old New England standards of faith. The opening years of his ministry were therefore very stirring and eventful. Dr. Codman was a man strong, solid, and practical, rather than brilliant. Blessed with fortune, he was able to become a public benefactor in a financial way, and took delight in imparting of his substance for individual and public good. His name abides in honor.



The Rev. William Jenks, D.D., more widely distinguished as an author than as a preacher, was well known in Boston in various connections from 1818 till his death in 1866, at the advanced age of eighty-eight. His gentlemanly person, his quiet manners, and his refined taste are well remembered by multitudes in the city. In the later years of his life, as he sat in the pulpit of the Old South Church on the Sabbath with his ear-trumpet, his saintly looks and gentle ways acted like a constant benediction upon the congregation. He was an able and instructive preacher in the

days of his strength and activity, but was more remarkable for his ripe learning and his great success in authorship. His *Comprehensive Commentary*, the fruit of the labor of many years, is said to have had a sale of 120,000 copies. Other works of his, illustrative of the Bible and designed as helps in its study, have had a large circulation

The stay of Dr. Lyman Beecher in Boston is to be regarded as a kind of episode in his long, stirring, and eventful life. He was resident here only from 1826 to 1832. But these were years when he was in the full plenitude



Lyman Beecher[1]

of his strength, — when his intellect was at the best, and his experience already large. Dr. Beecher, though quaint, odd, and absent-minded, was not unsymmetrical. He was a man to be trusted with great interests. While

[1] [This cut follows a portrait by Baird of Cincinnati, painted about 1843, and now owned by Mrs. Mary Foote Perkins, a daughter of Dr. Beecher. — Ed.]

he was pastor in Boston his influence in all the surrounding towns was very great. As an author, his published writings bear witness to the order and comprehensiveness of his thought. In short he was not, as some suppose, simply an impulsive and fiery orator, carrying his points by the sway and splendor of his rhetoric; he was a scholar also, — a man of system and orderly arrangement, working intelligently toward his end. He was unique to an extraordinary degree.

Fifty years ago the name of the Rev. B. B. Wisner, D.D., was one of the popular and beloved names of Boston. As pastor of the Old South Church from 1821 to 1832, and as one of the secretaries of the American Board from 1832 to his death in 1835, few men have more thoroughly won public affection and confidence. Of a fine presence and winning aspect, with an attractive address and a fluent speech, he was a general favorite with the people. He passed away at a comparatively early age, at a period when a man usually begins to take on his full mental vigor and compass. He was but thirty-nine at the time of his death, but left behind him an excellent record for culture, activity, and usefulness.



The Old South Church also suffered a severe affliction in the early death of the pastor immediately succeeding Dr. Wisner, — the Rev. Samuel H. Stearns. His ministry, begun in 1834, opened with great promise, and the young pastor was most highly esteemed and loved by his congregation. But his work was soon cut short by disease. He died after a ministry of only three years.

One of the early ministers of the church in Brighton was the celebrated Dr. William Adams, who after a long and very conspicuous life has recently passed away by death in the city of New York. His settlement at Brighton was in 1831, immediately after leaving the theological seminary. He had not then learned to use the treasures of his learning and power. In later years he became one of the foremost clergymen in the land. By his stately dignity and eloquence, few men could more adequately meet the requirements of a great occasion.[1]

The first pastor of the Salem-Street Church was the Rev. Justin Edwards, D.D. Before coming to Boston, he had been pastor at Andover for fifteen years. His pastorate at Boston was short, because of failing health; but after recovering strength he became a conspicuous worker through all the later years of his life in reformatory movements. He was the founder of the American Temperance Society, and became its secretary. He was actively engaged both as writer and public debater upon the Sabbath question. An immense number of copies of his



[1] [We owe to Dr. Wisner the only history we have of the Old South Church. — Ed.]

Sabbath Manual, his *Temperance Manual*, and of other of his works were circulated among the people. He was for several years the President of the Andover Theological Seminary.

In 1834 the Rev. Nehemiah Adams, D.D., began his ministry in Essex Street, as pastor of the Union Church, and from that time until recent years he has been one of the most marked men connected with the Boston ministry. Of conservative tendencies on all questions of theology and morals, of strong and abiding will, he was yet a man of such grace of culture, and such felicity of public address, that his services were always in full demand so long as his health and strength lasted. He had the delights and delicacies of literary culture to a most remarkable degree. In the fitness and aptness of his Scriptural quotations he was well-nigh unsurpassed. To all these advantages are to be added the comeliness and beauty of his person, and his calm self-possession in all public duties. He bore a prominent part in the religious controversies of his day, but took a greater delight in more quiet authorship. As a public writer he was large and comprehensive. There is a wide variety in the books which he has left behind; but they are all marked by the ever-recurring touches of his peculiar genius.

The first pastor of the Eliot Church, Boston Highlands, was the Rev. John S. C. Abbott, D.D., a man of quick and versatile genius, and holding pre-eminently the pen of a ready writer. In connection with his public labors in the ministry in various places he has been prolific in authorship to a remarkable degree, and his writings have enjoyed a large popularity. While many have not been able to coincide with some of his historical judgments, all will concede that there is a peculiar charm spread over the pages of his books. Few men have gathered about themselves a greater multitude of readers.



The Rev. Sereno E. Dwight, D.D., the second pastor of Park-Street Church, was the son of Dr. Timothy Dwight, President of Yale College. His own abilities, as well as his father's name, caused him to become conspicuous in public life during the early years of the present century. As a preacher and a writer he obtained a good reputation. After leaving Park Street in 1826, he was for a short period President of Hamilton College, New York, but was more largely engaged as a writer and author. He published several works, of which the most important was the life of his distinguished ancestor Jonathan Edwards, which makes the first volume in his ten-volume edition of Edwards's Works, published in 1830.

The Rev. Joel H. Linsley, D.D., pastor of Park-Street Church at a later date, was a man of very effective pulpit powers. Not demonstrative, not aiming at oratorical display, he was often eloquent after the most genuine fashion. He touched and captivated the heart. Simple and natural in

his daily life and in all his public addresses, he was a choice and valued Christian worker in his generation. After leaving Boston he became President of Marietta College, Ohio. His longest ministry was in his later years at Greenwich, Connecticut, where he died in 1868.

The Rev. Silas Aiken, D.D., successor to Dr. Linsley in the Park-Street pulpit, was a man different in the habits of his mind and in his constitutional tendencies; less tender and emotional, but strong, solid, and worthy. He had not the elements of a strictly popular preacher; but he had strength of understanding, and was a wise, faithful, judicious pastor, — a man to be honored and trusted. His pastoral care of the church continued for eleven years, from 1837 to 1848.

The Rev. Amos A. Phelps, connected as pastor with three of the Boston churches between the years 1832 and 1847, was a man who left behind him a much greater name than any immediate success would seem to warrant. The secret of this is to be found probably in the fact that he was a thoroughgoing Antislavery advocate at a time when Antislavery sentiments were not popular in the great cities of the north. Moreover, as an Antislavery man he did not consort with men of the radical type, but kept himself in strict alliance with the churches, where at the first he found little sympathy. As an acute and logical thinker, whose ideas though tardily received were at length victorious, he has an honor now which he did not enjoy in his lifetime. He was of a delicate constitution, and passed away at a comparatively early age. Few of his contemporaries, however, accomplished more than he in the cause of truth and righteousness.

Another Congregational minister, who like the preceding was cut off in the midst of his days, was the Rev. William M. Rogers, the brilliant pastor of Central Church from 1835 to 1851. For a number of years, while his health and strength were continued, there was no Congregational minister in Boston who had greater attractive power than he. The Central Church in those years was one of the places of popular resort. Mr. Rogers was of a slight figure, with marked nervous energy, and with a style of address that reached and thoroughly penetrated his hearers. He was averse to every form of radicalism. He might be called ultra-conservative. But notwithstanding these seeming drawbacks he had the elements of popularity in him to a marked degree, and filled a conspicuous place during the short period of his public activity.



The Rev. Samuel Green, the first pastor of Union Church, was one of those men of excellent quality and large promise who are not permitted to continue. After a ministry of eleven years in Essex Street he died at the age of forty-two, greatly beloved and honored. He was a brother of



the Rev. David Green, so widely known as a wise and able secretary of the American Board.

The successor of Dr. Lyman Beecher, at the Bowdoin-Street Church, was the Rev. Hubbard Winslow, D.D., who remained in office from 1832 to 1844. Mr. Winslow was a man of a companionable nature, easily accessible, and during his ministry Bowdoin-Street Church was full to overflowing. For some years no Congregational Church in Boston was more crowded. Dr. Winslow, though not a great preacher in the highest sense, had the power of adaptation to the wants of common minds, so that he was a favorite with the people. After leaving the ministry in 1844 he became well known as a teacher and writer. He published several volumes of a religious and practical nature which had a good circulation.

The Rev. Edward N. Kirk, D.D., came to Boston in 1842 to be made the first pastor of the Mount Vernon Church. Previous to his coming hither he had acquired a wide reputation as an evangelist. He was an accomplished pulpit orator, and wherever he went he was certain to draw crowds to hear him. He preached the gospel with great fervor and directness, and in a most winning manner. With a voice clear, rotund, musical, capable by its range of finding out the most distant hearer; with a figure full, graceful, easy of movement,— he had few equals in the land in making a popular impression. Turning from his life as an evangelist to become a settled pastor, many thought that he had perhaps made a mistake, and that the new enterprise would prove a failure in his hands. But on coming to Boston Dr. Kirk thoroughly identified himself with every good word and work. No man among us has been more widely connected with great evangelical movements, not only near at hand, but throughout the land and the world. His name has been as familiar almost in England, France, Germany, and Italy, as in the United States.

The Rev. William Ives Budington, D.D., was settled over the ancient church of Charlestown in 1840, and remained there fourteen years before his removal to Brooklyn, New York. He was a man of finished culture, of rare mental gifts and moral graces. As a public speaker, especially in extemporaneous address, he was often exceedingly felicitous. Wherever he went he was certain to win friends and draw men of kindred spirit into close companionship with himself. While in Charlestown he wrote his *History of the First Church*. The work was done on so large a plan, and the time covered by the history was so long, that great labor was involved in the undertaking. It was finished in a scholarly manner, and remains now as a standard book of reference.



Dr. Budington's successor at Charlestown was the Rev. James B. Miles D.D., who filled the pastoral office from 1855 to 1871, when he was dismissed to become secretary of the American Peace Society. In this connection he made the society known in this land and in foreign lands,

in a way in which it had not been known before. For some years Dr. Miles and the American Peace Society became familiar even in the courts of Europe. How far this work will abide, how permanent this influence



will prove, we cannot say; but certainly Dr. Miles used his office industriously, and carried his plans of peace and public arbitration in national affairs into the highest assemblies of the Old World.

The foregoing is a rapid review of some of the men who have stood in the Congregational pulpits of Boston during the last century. We have confined the sketch simply to those who are dead. There are many names among the living worthy of honorable mention.

If all the Congregational churches of Boston previously enumerated had lived until the present time, in addition to the two ancient churches already mentioned, we should find to-day within the city limits forty-three Congregational churches. Instead of this number we find but twenty-six. Seventeen of the churches enumerated above have died, or have been merged in others. This is the common fortune of churches of every order planted in great and growing cities. Changes of the most revolutionary kind are constantly taking place amid these city populations. The chief and chosen resorts for quiet residences in one generation become the principal centres of noise and traffic in the next. The places where the fathers most naturally gathered for their public worship are far away from the homes of the children. And so it happens almost inevitably, in the progress and growth of cities, that some churches must die while others are born.

To this cause, which is peculiar to cities, we may add others common alike to city and country. Some churches, wherever they may be, are but untimely births, growing out of strifes and divisions, or strange idiosyncrasies. Persons of discernment, looking on at the time, see that such churches will be short-lived in the nature of things. They are not born out of any real want, and have therefore no natural basis of health and growth.

Whether this church mortality, as we may call it, has been greater among the Congregationalists of Boston than in other denominations we have not undertaken to inquire; but, as before stated, on the territory of Boston, as it is now bounded, we have to-day twenty-six Congregational churches in place of the forty-three which would have been found here had death not invaded their ranks. But no enumeration of this kind can give any more than a very partial idea of the religious growth of the city during the last one hundred years. Before the age of railroads the city was the city, and the country was the country. But now there is a Boston which is very largely outside even of the enlarged city limits. There is a popula-

tion of many thousands in the suburban towns — ten, fifteen, twenty miles away — which in some sense belongs to the city as truly as though it dwelt within the city enclosure. There are churches representing the various denominations which have been formed out of this half city, half country population. No one can doubt that the churches of Chelsea, of Cambridge, of Newton, of Medford, of Malden, and divers other towns and villages depend for their chief strength and support upon men whose business life is in the neighboring city. If all the Congregational churches in these outlying districts which really draw their life from this tributary population could be added to those already enumerated, it would greatly swell the sum total of what is really to be credited to Boston.

All this history which has thus been briefly summarized will be more clearly and satisfactorily exhibited in the annexed tables, which will show the succession of churches and ministers in Boston from 1780 to the present time. Here it will be easy to trace the churches which have continued until this present time, and those which have died out or been merged in others.



TABLE SHOWING THE SUCCESSION OF CONGREGATIONAL CHURCHES OF BOSTON, WITH THEIR MINISTERS, FROM 1780 TO 1880.

The letters A. P. *standing against a name signify Acting Pastor.*

Churches, when organized.	Ministers.	Place and Date of Birth.	College, and Year of Graduation.	Date of Settlement.	Date of Dismission.	Date of Death.	Age.	Remarks.
Charlestown, First Church,[1] Nov. 2, 1632.	Thomas Prentice	Cambridge, Mass, Dec. 9, 1702	Harvard, 1726	Oct. 3, 1739		June 17, 1782	80	
	Joshua Paine	Sturbridge, Mass., 1763	Harvard, 1784	Jan. 10, 1787		Feb. 27, 1788	24	
	Jedidiah Morse, D.D.	Woodstock, Ct., Aug. 23, 1761	Yale, 1783	April 30, 1789	Feb. 22, 1820	June 9, 1826	65	
	Warren Fay, D.D.	Northboro', Mass., Feb. 17, 1784	Harvard, 1807	Feb. 23, 1820	Aug 16, 1839	Mar. 2, 1864	80	
	Wm. I. Budington, D.D.	New Haven, Ct., April 21, 1815	Yale, 1834	April 22, 1840	Sept 22, 1851	Nov. 29, 1879	64	
	James B. Miles, D.D.	Rutland, Mass., Aug. 18, 1823	Yale, 1849	Jan. 2, 1855	Oct. 2, 1871	Nov. 14, 1875	52	
	Francis F. Ford	Newark Vall., N.Y., Nov. 27, 1827	Hamilton, 1851	Dec. 11, 1872	Oct. 27, 1874			
	Henry L. Kendall	Barrington, R.I., March 5, 1849	Brown University, 1871	April 19, 1876	Nov. 13, 1879			
Old South,[2] May 5, 1669.	Joseph Eckley, D.D.	London, England, 1750	Coll. of N. Jersey, 1772	Oct. 27, 1779		April 30, 1811	61	
	Joshua Huntington	New London, Ct., Jan. 31, 1786	Yale, 1804	May 18, 1819		Sept. 11, 1819	34	
	Benj. B Wisner, D.D.	Goshen, N.Y., Sept 29, 1794	Union, 1813	Feb. 21, 1821	Nov. 12, 1832	Feb. 9, 1835	41	
	Samuel H. Stearns	Bedford, Mass., Sept. 12, 1801	Harvard, 1823	April 16, 1834		July 15, 1837	36	
	Geo. W. Blagden, D.D.	Washington, D.C., Oct. 3, 1802	Yale, 1823	Sept. 28, 1836				
	Jacob M. Manning, D.D	Greenwood, N.Y, Dec. 31, 1824	Amherst, 1850	Mar. 11, 1857				
Dorchester, Second Church, Jan. 1, 1808.	John Codman, D.D.	Boston, Mass., Aug. 3, 1782	Harvard, 1802	Dec. 7, 1808		Dec. 23, 1847	65	
	James H. Means, D.D.	Boston, Mass., Dec 13, 1823	Harvard, 1843	July 13, 1848	Dec. 20, 1878			
	Edward N. Packard	Lancaster, Mass., Dec. 16, 1838	Bowdoin, 1862	April 9, 1879				
Park Street, Feb. 27, 1809.	Edward D. Griffin, D.D.	East Haddam, Ct., Jan. 6, 1770	Yale, 1790	July 31, 1811	April 27, 1815	Nov. 8, 1837	67	
	Sereno E. Dwight, D.D.	Greenfield, Ct., May 18, 1786	Yale, 1803	Sept. 3, 1817	April 10, 1826	Nov. 30, 1850	64	
	Edward Beecher, D.D.	East Hampton, L.I., Aug. 22, 1803	Yale, 1822	Dec. 27, 1826	Oct. 28, 1830			
	Joel H. Linsley, D.D.	Cornwall, Vt., July 15, 1790	Middlebury, 1811	Dec. 5, 1832	Sept. 28, 1835	Mar. 23, 1868	77	
	Silas Aiken, D.D.	Bedford, N.H., May 14, 1799	Dartmouth, 1825	Mar. 22, 1837	July 12, 1848	April 7, 1869	70	
	Andrew L. Stone, D.D.	Oxford, Ct., Nov. 25, 1815	Yale, 1837	Jan. 25, 1849	Jan. 25, 1866			
	William H. H. Murray	Guilford, Ct., April 26, 1840	Yale, 1862	Nov. 11, 1868	Oct. 24, 1874			
	John L. Withrow, D.D.	Coatesville, Pa., March 19, 1837	Coll. of N. Jersey, 1860	Sept. 28, 1876				
Union (Essex Street) June 10, 1822.	Samuel Green	Stoneham, Mass., March 3, 1792	Harvard, 1816	Mar. 22, 1823	Mar. 26, 1834	Nov. 20, 1834	42	
	Nehemiah Adams, D.D.	Salem, Mass., Feb. 19, 1806	Harvard, 1826	Mar. 26, 1834		Oct. 6, 1878	72	
	Henry M. Parsons	East Haddam, Ct., Nov. 13, 1828	Yale, 1848	Dec. 1, 1870	Dec. 30, 1874			
	Franke A. Warfield	Holliston, Mass., Oct. 4, 1846	Yale,	Feb. 1, 1876				

[1] For list of pastors whose ministry closed before 1780 see *American Quarterly Register*, vol. xi., p. 46.

[2] For list of pastors whose ministry closed before 1780, see *Ibid.*, vol. vii., p. 29.

STATISTICS OF THE CONGREGATIONAL CHURCHES (*Continued*).

CHURCHES, WHEN ORGANIZED	MINISTERS.	PLACE AND DATE OF BIRTH.	COLLEGE AND YEAR OF GRADUATION.	DATE OF SETTLEMENT.	DATE OF DISMISSION.	DATE OF DEATH.	AGE.	REMARKS.
SOUTH BOSTON, PHILLIPS, Dec. 10, 1823.	Prince Hawes	Warren, Ct., 1783	Williams, 1805	April 28, 1824	April 18, 1827	Dec. 14, 1848	65	
	Joy H. Fairchild, D.D.	Guilford, Ct., April 24, 1790	Yale, 1813	Nov. 22, 1827	June 2, 1842	Mar. 21, 1859	69	
	Wm. W. Patton, D.D.	New York City, Oct. 19, 1821	New York Univ., 1839	Jan. 18, 1843	Dec. 22, 1845			
	John W. Alvord	East Hampton, Ct., April 18, 1807	Yale, A.M., 1842	Nov. 4, 1846	Mar. 24, 1852	Jan. 14, 1880	73	
	Charles S. Porter	Ashfield, Mass., Dec. 9, 1804	Amherst, 1827	Feb. 22, 1854	July 8, 1859	April 10, 1870	66	
	Edmund K. Alden, D.D.	Randolph, Mass., April 11, 1825	Amherst, 1844	Sept. 21, 1859	Nov. 2, 1876			
	Robert R. Meredith	Ireland, Feb. 8, 1838	Boston University, 1861	Nov. 13, 1878				
GREEN STREET, Dec. 30, 1823.	William Jenks, D.D.	Newton, Mass., Nov. 25, 1778	Harvard, 1797	Oct. 25, 1826	July, 1844	Nov. 13, 1866	88	United with Garden Street Church to form Messiah Church, July 1844.
BOWDOIN STREET (AT FIRST HANOVER ST.) July 18, 1825.	Lyman Beecher, D.D.	New Haven, Ct., Oct. 12, 1775	Yale, 1797	Jan. 19, 1826	Sept. 26, 1832	Jan. 10, 1863	88	
	Hubbard Winslow, D.D.	Williston, Vt., Oct. 30, 1799	Yale, 1825	Sept. 26, 1832	April 3, 1844	Aug. 13, 1864	65	
	Jared B. Waterbury, D.D.	New York City, Aug. 11, 1799	Yale, 1822	Sept 3, 1846	June 16, 1857	Dec. 31, 1879	80	
	Edwin Johnson	Plymouth, Ct., Dec. 1, 1826	Yale, 1846	June 29, 1859	Sept. 18, 1861			Church disbanded.
SALEM STREET, Sept. 1, 1827.	Justin Edwards, D.D.	Westhampton, Mass., Apr. 25, 1787	Williams, 1810	Jan. 1, 1828	Aug. 20, 1829	July 23, 1853	66	
	Geo. W. Blagden, D.D.	Washington, D.C., Oct. 3, 1802	Yale, 1823	Nov. 4, 1830	Sept. 5, 1836			
	Joseph H. Towne, D.D.	Salem, Mass., May 27, 1805	Yale, 1827	June 2, 1837	Dec. 27, 1843			
	Edward Beecher, D.D.	East Hampton, L.I., Aug. 22, 1803	Yale, 1822	Mar. 13, 1844	Nov. 7, 1855			
	George W. Field, D.D.	Belfast, Me., Dec. 19, 1818	Bowdoin, 1837	Oct. 15, 1856	Oct. 28, 1863			
	Solomon P. Fay, A.P.	Westboro', Mass., June 21, 1820	Marietta, 1844	Nov. 1, 1863	May 6, 1866			United with the Mariners' Church, Dec. 2, 1866.
BERKELEY (FORMERLY PINE) ST., Sept. 2, 1827.	Thos. H. Skinner, D.D.	Harvey's Neck, N.C., Mar. 7, 1791	Coll. of N. Jersey, 1809	April 10, 1828	Aug. 18, 1828	Feb. 1, 1871	80	
	John Brown, D.D.	Brooklyn, Ct., July 4, 1786	Dartmouth, 1809	Mar. 4, 1829	Feb. 6, 1831	Mar. 22, 1839	52	
	Amos A. Phelps	Farmington, Ct., Nov. 11, 1804	Yale, 1826	Sept. 13, 1832	Mar. 26, 1834	July 30, 1847	43	
	Artemas Boies	Blandford, Mass., Sept. 8, 1792	Williams, 1816	Dec. 10, 1834	Oct. 9, 1840	Sept. 25, 1844	52	
	Austin Phelps, D.D.	W. Brookfield, Mass., Jan. 7, 1820	Univ. of Penn., 1837	Mar. 31, 1842	Mar. 11, 1848			
	Henry M. Dexter, D.D.	Plympton, Mass., Aug. 13, 1821	Yale, 1840	April 19, 1849	June 28, 1867			
	William B. Wright	Cincinnati, O., April 15, 1838	Dartmouth, 1857	Oct. 30, 1867				
BRIGHTON, Sept. 13, 1827.	Geo. W. Blagden, D.D.	Washington, D.C., Oct. 3, 1802	Yale, 1823	Dec. 26, 1827	Sept. 3, 1830			
	William Adams, D.D.	Colchester, Ct., Jan. 25, 1807	Yale, 1827	Feb. 2, 1831	April 23, 1834	Aug. 31, 1880	73	
	Wm. W. Newell, D.D.	South Natick, Mass., Sept. 17, 1807	Yale, 1830	Aug. 19, 1834	June 13, 1837			
	Samuel Lamson	Salem, Mass., June 6, 1807	Brown University, 1828	Sept. 20, 1837	Sept. 16, 1841	Jan. 24, 1864	57	
	John R. Adams, D.D.	Plainfield, Ct., March 20, 1802	Yale, 1821	Feb. 2, 1842	Dec. 16, 1846	April 25, 1866	64	

	Arthur Swazey, D.D.	Bucksport, Me., June 22, 1824	Bowdoin, 1844	Oct. 6, 1847	May 13, 1856			
	Thomas O. Rice	Ashby, Mass., Aug. 10, 1815	Amherst, 1839	April 6, 1858	July 6, 1859			
	Richard G. Greene	East Haddam, Ct., June 29, 1829	Yale, A.M., 1873	Sept. 19, 1860	Aug. 1862			
	John P. Cushman	Troy, N.Y., Jan. 19, 1830	Union, 1851	Jan. 11, 1863	April, 1866			
	David T. Packard	N. B'dgew'r, Mass., Aug. 24, 1824	Amherst, 1850	Dec. 6, 1866	Aug. 11, 1873	Nov. 28, 1880	56	
	Henry A. Stevens	Salisbury, N. H., Dec. 29, 1834	Amherst, 1857	June 11, 1874				
Dorchester, Village Church, March 11, 1829.	David Sanford	Medway, Mass., Aug. 28, 1801	Brown University, 1825	July 14, 1830	Sept. 17, 1838	Dec. 17, 1875	74	
	Daniel Butler	Hartford, Ct., June 23, 1808	Yale, 1835	Oct. 31, 1838	Jan. 31, 1845			
	David Dyer	England, 1811		April 9, 1845	June 1, 1852	Feb. 8, 1870	59	
	Daniel T. Noyes	Boston, April 20, 1824	Yale, 1847	Feb. 16, 1853	Feb. 14, 1855	Oct. 4, 1862	38	
	Theodore T. Munger	Bainbridge, N. Y., March 5, 1830	Yale, 1851	Feb. 6, 1856	Oct. 22, 1860			
	Edmund S. Potter	Leyden, Mass. Oct. 31, 1813		Feb. 13, 1861	May 4, 1863			
	A. J. Rich	Cooper, Me., Dec. 6, 1834		Mar. 30, 1864	Dec. 13, 1866			
	H. M. Tenney	Hanover, N. H., May 16, 1841	Amherst, 1864	Oct. 21, 1868	Sept. 21, 1870			
	William B. Clarke	Cuba, Dec. 27, 1829	Yale, 1849	April 1, 1871	June 30, 1873			...
	Philander Thurston	Pelham, Mass., May 25, 1837	Amherst, 1865	Jan. 21, 1875	Jan. 21, 1880			
	Solomon P. Fay, A.F.	Westboro', Mass., June 21, 1820	Marietta, 1844	Sept. 26, 1880				
Mariners' Church, Jan. 20, 1830.	Daniel M. Lord	Lyme, Ct., April 9, 1800	Amherst, 1830	Nov. 11, 1834	July 20, 1848	Aug. 26, 1861	61	
	George W. Bourne	Wells, Me., 1813	Bangor Institute, 1837	Feb. 15, 1849	1854	April 23, 1872	59	
	Elijah Kellogg, A.P.	Portland, Me., March, 1813	Bowdoin, 1840	1855	1866			United with Salem-Street Church, Dec. 2, 1866.
Charlestown, Winthrop Church, Jan. 9, 1833.	Daniel Crosby	Hampden, Me., Oct 1799	Yale, 1823	Aug. 1833	May 28, 1842	Feb. 28, 1843	43	
	John Humphrey	Fairfield, Ct., March 19, 1816	Amherst, 1835	Nov. 30, 1842	Mar. 26, 1847	Dec. 2, 1851	38	
	Benj. Tappan, D.D.	Augusta, Me., June 26, 1815	Bowdoin, 1833	Oct. 4, 1849	Aug. 10, 1857			
	A. E. Kittredge, D.D.	Roxbury, Mass., July 20, 1834	Williams, 1854	Sept. 14, 1859	Dec. 2, 1863			
	J. E. Rankin, D.D.	Thornton, Vt., Jan. 2, 1828	Middlebury, 1848	Dec. 1, 1864	Oct. 29, 1869			
	Alexander S. Twombly	Boston, Mass., March 14, 1832	Yale, 1854	May 2, 1872				
Boston Highlands, Eliot Church, Sept. 18, 1834.	John S. C. Abbott, D.D.	Brunswick, Me., Sept. 18, 1805	Bowdoin, 1825	Nov. 25, 1835	Jan. 13, 1841	June 17, 1877	71	
	Aug. C. Thompson, D.D.	Goshen, Ct., April 30, 1812	Yale, A.M., 1841	July 27, 1842				
	Benjamin F. Hamilton	Chester, Mass., Nov. 4, 1835	Amherst, 1861	Nov. 9, 1871	.....			
West Roxbury, South Evan. Church, June 11, 1835.	Christopher Marsh	Campton, N. H., Aug. 1794	Dartmouth, 1820	May 17, 1837	Dec. 11, 1853	June 30, 1859	64	
	Thomas Laurie, D.D.	Craglieth, Scotland, May 19, 1821	Illinois, 1838	May 7, 1851	Jan. 20, 1868			
	William S. Hubbell	Wolcottville, Ct., April 19, 1837	Yale, 1858	Jan. 30, 1868	Jan. 25, 1872			
	Edward Strong, D.D.	Somers, Ct., Oct. 25, 1813	Yale, 1838	May 2, 1872				

STATISTICS OF THE CONGREGATIONAL CHURCHES (*Continued*).

CHURCHES, WHEN ORGANIZED.	MINISTERS.	PLACE AND DATE OF BIRTH.	COLLEGE AND YEAR OF GRADUATION.	DATE OF SETTLEMENT.	DATE OF DISMISSION.	DATE OF DEATH.	AGE.	REMARKS.
CENTRAL CHURCH, May 11, 1835.	William M. Rogers	Island of Alderney, Sept. 10, 1806	Harvard, 1827	Aug. 6, 1835		Aug. 10, 1851	45	
	George Richards	New London, Ct., Nov. 2, 1816	Yale, 1840	Oct. 8, 1845	April 20, 1859	Oct. 20, 1870	54	
	John E. Todd, D.D.	Northampton, Mass., Dec. 6, 1833	Yale, 1855	Feb. 2, 1860	April 28, 1869			
	John DeWitt, D.D.	Harrisburg, Pa., Oct. 10, 1842	Col. of N. Jersey, 1861	Dec. 1, 1869	Dec. 30, 1875			
	Joseph T. Duryea, D.D.	Jamaica, L. I., Dec. 9, 1832	Col. of N. Jersey, 1856	April 17, 1879				
EAST BOSTON, MAVERICK CHURCH, May 31, 1836.	Wm. W. Newell, D.D.	So. Natick, Mass., Sept. 17, 1807	Yale, 1830	July 19, 1837	July 21, 1841			
	Amos A. Phelps	Farmington, Ct., Nov. 11, 1804	Yale, 1826	Mar. 2, 1842	June 2, 1845	July 30, 1847	43	
	Robert S. Hitchcock	Newport, R.I., 1818	Amherst, 1837	Nov. 18, 1846	Nov. 6, 1850			
	Rufus W. Clark, D.D.	Newburyport, Mass., Dec. 17, 1813	Yale, 1838	Dec. 3, 1851	April 8, 1857			
	Thomas N. Haskell	Mina, N. Y., Jan. 20, 1826	Miami University, 1851	June 24, 1858	Mar. 5, 1862			
	Joel S. Bingham, D.D.	Cornwall, Vt., Oct. 16, 1815	Univ. of Vermont, 1848	Mar. 10, 1863	Sept. 6, 1870			
	Dan'l W. Waldron, A.P.	Augusta, Me., Nov. 11, 1840	Bowdoin, 1862	June 1, 1871	Dec. 1, 1872			
	J. V. Hilton, A.P.	Andes, N. Y., Aug. 7, 1838	Kenyon, 1859	July 1, 1873	April 1, 1880			
	John H. Barrows	Medina, Mich., July 11, 1847	Olivet, 1867	Dec. 1, 1880				
FREE CHURCH, MARLBOROUGH CHAPEL, 1836.	Charles Fitch	Lisbon, Ct., 1804		May 31, 1836	1839	1843	39	
	Amos A. Phelps	Farmington, Ct., Nov. 11, 1804	Yale, 1826	July 24, 1839	1841	July 30, 1847	43	Supplied for some time after by different preachers, and then disbanded.
GARDEN STREET, July 27, 1841.	William R. Chapman	Bethel, Me., Feb. 26, 1812	Dartmouth, 1837	Sept. 8, 1841	July, 1844	Oct. 25, 1855	43	United with Green Street to form Messiah Church, July, 1844.
MT. VERNON, June 1, 1842.	Edward N. Kirk, D.D.	New York City, Aug. 14, 1802	Col. of N. Jersey, 1820	June 1, 1842		Mar. 27, 1874	72	
	Sam'l E. Herrick, D.D.	Southampton, L. I., April 6, 1841	Amherst, 1859	April 21, 1871				
MESSIAH CHURCH, Oct., 1844.	William Jenks, D.D.	Newton, Mass., Nov. 25, 1778	Harvard, 1797	July 23, 1844	1846	Nov. 13, 1866	88	Both pastors dismissed and church disbanded in 1846.
	William R. Chapman	Bethel, Me., Feb. 26, 1812	Dartmouth, 1837	July 23, 1844	1846	Oct. 25, 1855	43	
LEYDEN, Feb. 7, 1844	Joseph H. Towne, D.D.	Salem, Mass., May 27, 1805	Yale, 1827	Feb. 28, 1844				Voted July 1847 to suspend public worship.
CHURCH OF THE PILGRIMS, July 1, 1844.	Matthew Hale Smith	Portland, Me., Oct. 15, 1810		Oct. 18, 1846	1849	Nov. 7, 1879	69	
	S. H. Higgins, D.D.	Cambridge, Md., Aug. 5, 1813	Univ. of Maryland, 1832	July, 1850	1852			Soon became extinct.
SO. BOSTON, PAYSON CHURCH, July 16, 1845.	Joy H. Fairchild, D.D.	Guilford, Ct., April 24, 1790	Yale, 1813	July 16, 1845		Mar. 21, 1859	69	Merged in E St. Church March 21, 1860.

SHAWMUT CHURCH, Nov. 20, 1845	George A. Oviatt	Bridgeport, Ct., April 5, 1811	Yale, 1835	Nov. 20, 1845	Mar. 28, 1849			
	William C. Foster	Hanover, N. H., July 8, 1815	Dartmouth, 1841	Oct. 25, 1849	Dec. 30, 1851			
	Charles Smith	Hatfield, Mass., Aug. 10, 1818	Amherst, 1841	Dec. 8, 1853	Nov. 8, 1858			
	Edwin B. Webb, D.D.	Newcastle, Me., Jan. 19, 1820	Bowdoin, 1846	Oct. 5, 1860				
CHARLESTOWN, BETHESDA CHURCH, June 10, 1847.	Jesse Guernsey, D.D.	Watertown, Ct., July 8, 1822		June 10, 1847	April 21, 1849	Nov. 24, 1871	49	Merged in Winthrop Church.
EDWARDS CHURCH, Feb. 1, 1849.	Christo'r Cushing, D.D.	Scituate, Mass., May 3, 1820	Yale, 1844	Feb. 21, 1849	April 23, 1851			
	Preston Pond	Wrentham, Mass., Feb. 14, 1818	Bowdoin, 1840	Feb. 25, 1852		Aug. 1853	35	Disbanded by advice of council, in 1853.
JAMAICA PLAIN, CENTRAL CHURCH, Sept. 29, 1853.	Alonzo H. Quint, D.D.	Barnstead, N. H., March 22, 1828	Dartmouth, 1846	Dec. 27, 1853	May 12, 1863			
	Francis B. Perkins	Boston, Mass., Aug. 7, 1833	Williams, 1854	Sept. 21, 1864	Oct. 1, 1870			
	Joseph B. Clark	Sturbridge, Mass., Oct. 7, 1836	Amherst, 1858	Oct. 8, 1872	Oct. 21, 1879			
	George M. Boynton	Brooklyn, N.Y., May 13, 1837	New York Univ., 1858	Mar. 24, 1880				
BOSTON HIGHLANDS, IMMANUEL (FORMERLY VINE ST.) CHURCH, April 9, 1857.	John O. Means, D.D.	Augusta, Me., Aug. 1, 1822	Bowdoin, 1843	June 3, 1857	Sept. 13, 1877			
	Lyman H. Blake	Cornwall, Vt., July 19, 1840	Middlebury, 1863	Sept. 13, 1877				
SOUTH BOSTON, CHURCH OF THE UNITY, Oct. 14, 1857.	Charles S. Porter	Ashfield, Mass., Dec. 9, 1804	Amherst, 1827	Oct. 14, 1857	Mar. 21, 1860	April 10, 1870	66	Merged in E. Street Church, March 21, 1860.
NEPONSET, TRINITY CHURCH, May 11, 1859.	Marshall B. Angier	Southboro', Mass., March 22, 1819	Yale, 1844	May 22, 1860	Jan. 2, 1862			
	J. B. Johnson, A.P.	Boston, Mass., Oct. 9, 1825		1862	1864			
	Geo. E. Freeman, A.P.	Liverpool, Nova Scotia, 1831		1865	1867			
	Clark Carter	Boston, Mass., Oct. 4, 1841	Harvard, 1862	Feb. 13, 1868	July 2, 1869			
	Rowland H. Allen	Norton, Mass., Aug. 13, 1840	Amherst, 1862	Feb. 8, 1870		Sept. 12 1872	32	
	Myron A. Munson, A.P.	Chester, Mass., May 5, 1835	Harvard, 1860	Jan. 1, 1874	Jan. 1, 1876			
	John H. Gurney, A.P.	Dover, Me., Sept. 21, 1821	Oberlin, 1845	July 2, 1876	July 31, 1877			
	Robert F. Gordon, A.P.	Glasgow, Scotland, May 23, 1828	Edinburgh, 1858	Sept. 1877				
SPRINGFIELD STREET, Jan. 4, 1860.	John L. Graves	Sunderland, Mass., Aug. 15, 1831	Amherst, 1855	Jan. 4, 1860	June. 1862			
	Daniel Tenney	Chester, N.H., Dec. 10, 1816	Dartmouth, 1841	June 25, 1862	Nov. 14. 1865			
	Benj. F. Parsons, A.P.	Wiscasset, Me., June 21. 1820	Bowdoin, 1842	Sept. 1868	Sept. 1869			In 1869 became Presbyterian.
SOUTH BOSTON, E STREET CHURCH, March 21, 1860.	Charles S. Porter	Ashfield, Mass., Dec. 9, 1804	Amherst, 1827	Mar. 21, 1860	1863	April 10, 1870	66	
	A. R. Baker, D.D., A.P.	Franklin, Mass., Aug. 30, 1805	Amherst, 1830	1864	1865	April 30, 1876	71	
	Edward A. Rand	Portsmouth, N.H., April 5, 1837	Bowdoin, 1857	June 18, 1867	Oct. 9, 1876			
	Fred H. Allen	Lyme, N.H., Oct. 1, 1845		Jan. 1, 1877	Jan. 1, 1878			
	Simeon S. Hughson	Chester, N.J., March 27, 1823	Oberlin, 1847	Mar. 1, 1878				

STATISTICS OF THE CONGREGATIONAL CHURCHES (*Concluded*).

CHURCHES, WHEN ORGANIZED.	MINISTERS.	PLACE AND DATE OF BIRTH.	COLLEGE AND YEAR OF GRADUATION.	DATE OF SETTLEMENT.	DATE OF DISMISSION.	DATE OF DEATH.	AGE.	REMARKS.
OAK PLACE, June 21, 1860	Charles Smith, A.P.	Hatfield, Mass., Aug. 10, 1818	Amherst, 1841	June 21, 1860	April 30, 1862			
	Joseph P. Bixby	Thompson, Ct., Jan. 28, 1833	Williams, 1858	April 30, 1862	1864			United in 1864 with Presbyterian Church in Beach St., and Mr. Bixby became pastor of the United Church.
CHAMBERS-ST. CHURCH,[1] Dec. 4, 1861.	G. R. W. Scott, A.P.	Pittsburg, Pa., April 17, 1842	Middlebury, 1864	Nov. 16, 1873	Dec. 1, 1875			
	Frederick B. Allen, A.P.	Boston, Mass., Nov. 5, 1840	Amherst, 1863	Jan. 16, 1876	Feb. 1, 1879			
	Stacy Fowler, A.P.	Sangerville, Me. Feb. 27, 1831		Feb. 8, 1879	June 1, 1879			United with Mount Vernon Church.
DORCHESTER, PILGRIM CHURCH, Nov. 2, 1862.	Edmund Squire[2]	Taunton, Eng., March 14, 1815	King Alfred School, [minster, Eng.	Nov. 13, 1867	Dec. 1868			
	H. M. Dexter, D.D., A.P.	Plympton, Mass., Aug. 13, 1821	Yale, 1840	Jan. 1, 1869	Jan. 1, 1871			
	Frederick R. Abbe	Litchfield, Ct., Oct. 28, 1827	Yale, 1848	May 10, 1871	June 4, 1873			
	Frederick A. Hand	Hancock, Mass., Oct. 23, 1842	Williams, 1867	Dec. 10, 1873	Mar. 31, 1875	Oct. 4, 1880	38	
	H. A. Shorey	Industry, Me., Feb. 7, 1831		Jan. 15, 1878	Dec. 16, 1879			
	Stacy Fowler, A.P.	Sangerville, Me., Feb. 27, 1831		Sept. 6, 1879	June 8, 1880			
SALEM AND MARINERS, Dec. 2, 1866.	J. M. H. Dow, A.P.	Atkinson, N. H., March 8, 1813		1866	1869	June 25, 1878	65	
	Stephen H. Hayes, A.P.	Industry, Me., Nov. 14, 1813	Bowdoin, 1838	May 1870	Nov. 21, 1879			Disbanded Nov. 21 1879.
BOSTON HIGHLANDS, HIGHLAND CHURCH, March 9, 1869.	Albert E. Dunning	Brookfield, Ct., Jan. 5, 1844	Yale, 1867	Sept. 30, 1870	Jan. 25, 1881			
BOSTON HIGHLANDS, WALNUT AV. CHURCH, Dec. 19, 1870.	Albert H. Plumb	Gowanda, N.Y., Aug. 23, 1829	Brown University, 1855	Jan. 4, 1872				
BOSTON HIGHLANDS, CHURCH OF THE HOLLANDERS, Feb. 20, 1873.	Guy Van Der Kreeke	Holland, Europe, Sept. 9, 1847	Hope Col., Mich., 1868	Feb. 20, 1873				
OLIVET CHURCH, Jan. 12, 1876.	Henry M. Parsons	East Haddam, Ct., Nov. 13, 1828	Yale, 1848	Feb. 16, 1876	Sept. 26, 1877			
	Fred H. Allen	Lyme, N. H., Oct. 1, 1845		April 1, 1878	April 19, 1879			
	David A. Stearns	Pictou, N.S., June 2, 1844		June 2, 1880				
JAMAICA PLAIN, BOYLSTON CHURCH, Feb. 4, 1879.	Sherberne S. Mathews	Salisbury, Mass., June 3, 1847		Feb. 4, 1879				

[1] Supplied by the pastors of the Old South Church until the year 1873.

[2] He was Acting Pastor from Nov. 2, 1862, until Nov. 13, 1867.

CHAPTER VIII.

THE BAPTISTS IN BOSTON DURING THE LAST HUNDRED YEARS.

BY THE REV. HENRY M. KING, D D,
Pastor of the Dudley-Street Baptist Church, Roxbury.

ONE hundred years ago there were only two Baptist churches in Boston, and they were not strong in the number or social influence of their members. The First Baptist Church had had an existence of one hundred and fifteen years, having been organized in Charlestown in 1665, and after so long a period did not number more than one hundred and fifty members. The Second Baptist Church, subsequently known as the Baldwin-Place Church, and at the present time bearing the name of the Warren-Avenue Church, had been formed in 1743, and at the end of forty years had forty-three members. In 1784 published statistics of the denomination reported two hundred and one professing Baptists in Boston.

It is not necessary to present at length the reasons for this slowness of growth, or to give in detail the causes which prevented the views of the Baptists from taking root more quickly and bringing forth fruit more abundantly. It is enough to say that the soil was preoccupied; that legislation was adverse to the introduction or progress of Baptist principles; and that there was a strong public sentiment in opposition to any religious beliefs or organizations differing from those of "the standing order."

It should be remarked, however, that open hostility had ceased long before 1780, and the spirit of religious toleration (that plant of slow growth and tardy maturity), and even of friendliness, was becoming more and more prevalent. It had been one hundred and thirty-six years since Mr. Painter had been publicly whipped at Hingham for refusing to allow his child to be baptized, and a whole century had passed away since the doors of the meeting-house of the First Baptist Church were nailed up by order of the Governor and Council of the Colony of Massachusetts Bay, under date of March 8, 1680. Indeed, in 1718, when Rev. Elisha Callender was ordained as pastor of the First Baptist Church, three Congregational ministers — the Mathers, father and son, and Rev. John Webb — accepted invitations to be present at the service. Mr. Callender was a graduate of the College at Cambridge, and

this fact may not have been without its influence on their minds. Rev. Cotton Mather preached the sermon on that occasion, choosing for his theme, "Good Men United." In the sermon he earnestly condemned "the withdrawal of fellowship from good men," and the disposition to "inflict uneasy circumstances upon them, under the wretched notion of *wholesome severities;*" he denounced that "cruel wrath," which is "good for nothing but only to make divisions in Jacob and dispersions in Israel," and followed his denunciation with the very humble and frank confession, expressive of his own position and undoubtedly of the changing sentiment of his people, that "New England also has, in some former times, done something of this aspect, which would not now be so well approved of; in which, if the

REV. SAMUEL STILLMAN, D.D.

brethren in whose house we are now convened, met with anything too unbrotherly, they now with satisfaction hear us expressing our dislike of everything that has looked like persecution in the days that have passed over us."

The better times had come. The rights of private judgment and personal conscience in matters of religious faith and worship were quite generally acknowledged, although laws were still in force which allowed the taxation of all lands for the support of the town minister, and it was not until 1832 that the last vestige of oppressive legislation was removed from the statute books of Massachusetts.

In 1780 Rev. Samuel Stillman, A.M., was pastor of the First Baptist Church, having been settled fifteen years before, and Rev. Isaac Skillman, A.M., had had for seven years the pastoral care of the Second Baptist Church. Mr. Skillman remained in the pastoral office until 1787. After the brief ministry and sudden death of Rev. Thomas Gair, the Second Church secured the services of Rev. Thomas Baldwin in 1790. Under the ministry of these two eminent preachers, Dr. Stillman and Dr. Baldwin, whose memory is still gratefully cherished in the denomination, the two Baptist churches were greatly strengthened and increased. The two hundred and one members of 1784 became four hundred and twenty-five members in 1795. The relations between the two churches and their pastors were of the most fraternal kind. Although the Second Church had gone out from the First, because the pastor at that time, Rev. Jeremiah Condy, was thought to be slightly tainted with Arminianism; and although Dr. Stillman and Dr. Baldwin sympathized with different political parties in the exciting discussions at the beginning of the present century, so that on Thanksgiving and Fast days the congregations were considerably intermingled, and "the Federalists naturally went to Stillman Street and the Democrats to Baldwin Place,"—yet it was an era of unbroken harmony and prosperity. The favor of God rested upon his servants and their labors.

Dr. Stillman continued to be pastor of the First Church for forty-two years. He died March 12, 1807, greatly beloved and honored. His fellow laborer and intimate friend, Dr. Baldwin, preached the sermon at his funeral, and it is said that "all the members of the society appeared with badges of mourning, the women with black bonnets and handkerchiefs." Dr. Baldwin remained pastor of the Second Church thirty-five years. His death occurred Aug. 29, 1825, and called forth expressions of universal sorrow. "The bells of the city were tolled, and his funeral, attended by the Governor of the Commonwealth, by other high officials, both of the State and the city, and by the clergy of all denominations, was signalized by manifestations of respect seldom equalled." The following lines have been fittingly used to portray his character: —

"*He was a good man.* On his open brow
Benignity had set her brightest seal;
And though the iron hand of Time might plough
Some furrows there, still you could not but feel,
When looking on him, that the highest weal
Of human kind was to his bosom dear;
Age did not cloud it, age could not conceal
The beam that shone so pure, so warm, so clear:
Such was the man of God whose memory all revere."

During Dr. Baldwin's ministry the church received such increase that its wooden house of worship was enlarged in 1797, and in 1810 was removed to make room for a larger edifice of brick, which was dedicated Jan. 1, 1811. This building, which was vacated by the church on its removal to Warren

Avenue, was purchased by one of Boston's well-known charities, the Baldwin-Place Home for Little Wanderers.

Under such eminent leadership, crowned with the divine blessing, the principles held by the Baptists became better known and found intelligent and conscientious believers, and the size and strength of the denomination were steadily increased. The First Church, having worshipped for one hundred and fifty years by the side of what was then called the "mill-pond," on the north side of Stillman Street, between Salem and Pond streets (a second and larger edifice having been built on the same spot during the period), removed to a new meeting-house situated at the corner of Union and Hanover streets, in June, 1829. This building it occupied for twenty-four years, when, in 1853, compelled by the encroachments of business upon its location, it transferred itself to Somerset Street, where upon a most eligible site it erected a beautiful sanctuary, whose lofty spire overlooks the city, and is a conspicuous object to those who approach from the sea. This building, also, the church at length vacated by reason of the very general removal of its families to the south end of the city, and in 1877 it united with the Shawmut-Avenue Baptist Church, worshipping at the corner of Shawmut Avenue and Rutland Street, the new church taking the name and inheriting the rich history of the mother church.

Soon after the beginning of the present century the growth of the denomination began to manifest itself in the springing up of new churches within the city limits and in the immediate suburbs. The following table of decades will show the number of churches established, and the order of their organization. The list includes, in addition to those suburban towns which have been actually annexed to Boston, those whose inhabitants largely do business in Boston, and might properly be reckoned in its population, — such as Brookline and Cambridge. The dates are those of organization: —

FIRST DECADE, — 1800 to 1810.

First Baptist Church, Charlestown	1801
Independent (colored)	1805
Charles Street (formerly called the Third)	1807

SECOND DECADE, — 1810 to 1820.

First Cambridge	1817
Arlington	1817

THIRD DECADE, — 1820 to 1830.

Dudley Street (Roxbury)	1821
Clarendon Street (at first Federal Street, afterward Rowe Street)	1827
Second Cambridge	1827
Brookline	1828
South Baptist (South Boston)	1828

FOURTH DECADE, — 1830 to 1840.

North Baptist (disbanded 1840)	1835
First Chelsea	1836
Neponset Avenue (Dorchester)	1837
Harvard Street (formerly called Boylston Street)	1839
Tremont Street (now Union Temple)	1839

FIFTH DECADE, — 1840 to 1850.

Bowdoin Square	1840
Jamaica Plain	1842
Old Cambridge	1844
Union Church (now Union Temple)	1844
High Street (Charlestown, disbanded 1863)	1844
Central Square (East Boston)	1844
Stoughton Street (Dorchester)	1845
Tremont (Roxbury, disbanded 1866)	1845
Twelfth Church (colored)	1848

SIXTH DECADE, — 1850 to 1860.

First Mariners'	1851
Bunker Hill (Charlestown)	1851
Brighton Avenue (Allston)	1853
North Cambridge	1854
Shawmut Avenue (united with First Church)	1856
Fourth Street (South Boston)	1858
Cary Avenue (Chelsea)	1859

SEVENTH DECADE, — 1860 to 1870.

Union Temple	1863
Broadway (Cambridge)	1865
Dearborn Street (Roxbury)	1870
Ruggles Street (Roxbury)	1870
Ebenezer (colored)	1871
Winthrop	1871
Tabernacle (Roxbury, disbanded 1877)	1873
Roslindale (West Roxbury)	1874
Charles River (Cambridge)	1876
Day Star (colored)	1876
Revere	1877
Trinity (East Boston)	1878
Union Church (Cambridge, colored)	1879
First German	1879

EIGHTH DECADE, — 1870 to 1880.

On the average more than one Baptist church for each two years has been organized within what may now be called Boston, since the beginning of the present century. With very few exceptions, these churches still live, and give abundant promise of growth and yet further multiplication. The few exceptions are the result not of any defection or surrender of principles, but of the receding of the tide of population, or a lack of wisdom in the choice of location. In two or three instances two churches have united their strength for the accomplishment of a larger work.

The limits of a single chapter will preclude even the briefest outline of the history and activity of this band of Christian churches of like faith, and will prevent the mention even of the names of the ministers who, for a longer or shorter period, have served them in the past, or are filling their pulpits to-day. But in addition to the names of Dr. Samuel Stillman and Dr. Thomas Baldwin, already mentioned, there are a few names of Baptist preachers, who by their special eminence, as well as by their prolonged service in this city, have been honored no less by other denominations than by their own. So intimately connected have they been with the progress of Baptist churches and principles in Boston during the last seventy years that the omission of their names in the briefest history would be an unpardonable neglect in the historian.

Rev. Daniel Sharp, D.D., was the second pastor of the Charles-Street Church. Entering into this official relation in 1812, he remained in it until his death in 1853, his ministry covering a period of forty-one years. There are many who still delight to recall "his erect form and noble countenance, his personal dignity and natural eloquence." His preaching was characterized as "lucid, serious, instructive, earnest," and he is said to have been "an enthusiastic believer in the ethics of Christianity," and to have "attached special importance to the culture of the moral virtues as the fruits of a genuine faith." His pulpit was one of great attractiveness and power, and he gave himself freely to every noble reform and every great denominational enterprise.

Rev. Baron Stow, D.D., began his ministry in Boston in 1832. For six-

teen years he was pastor of the Second or Baldwin-Place Church, and then for nineteen years the pastor of the Rowe Street, now the Clarendon-Street Church. He was "eminent as a Christian, a philanthropist, and a preacher," and "to every post of duty and labor he brought a sound judgment, an earnest purpose, a prayerful and conciliatory spirit." His preaching was thoroughly scriptural, with the doctrinal and practical judiciously united, and, when he was in the vigor of his manhood, was characterized by a kindling eloquence, which made him one of the most popular pulpit orators of his time. His wisdom and zeal were felt in every department of Christian labor.

Rev. Rollin Heber Neale, D.D., was called to the First Church in 1837, and held the position of pastor until 1877, when, no longer able to bear the burdens of the active ministry, he resigned his official relation with the church, but continued in its endeared fellowship until his death in September, 1879. Endowed with superior mental gifts, with largeness of heart and catholicity of spirit, he stood for forty years at his important post, the trusted pastor, the eloquent preacher, the friend of all good causes; and thus with a hand of love he wrote the long story of his ministerial fidelity, and died sincerely esteemed and greatly beloved by all who knew him.

Rev. Francis Wayland, D.D., who during a presidency of twenty-five years at Brown University acquired a renown as an educator second to that of no one in New England, was, for five years previous to his connection with the college, pastor of the First Baptist Church in this city. Though his pastorate of the church was brief, he added strength to the denominational life and to the whole religious life of Boston, and the glory of his name still lingers about the pulpit of the old church which he served.

The names of Rev. James M. Winchell, called "the beloved Winchell;" of Rev. Bela Jacobs, the early and life-long friend of Newton Theological Institution; of Rev. James D. Knowles, the accomplished Christian gentleman and scholar, who went from the pulpit of the Baldwin-Place Church to a Professor's chair at Newton; of Rev. Henry Jackson, D.D.; of Rev. Howard Malcom, D.D.; of Rev. Robert W. Cushman, D.D.; and of Rev. Sumner R. Mason, D.D., — all of whom were able expounders of the Word and faithful ministers of their respective churches, — are as familiar to Baptists as household words.

These men and others not less worthy of mention, the living and the dead, — and not only clergymen, but distinguished laymen not a few, — have toiled and prayed and sacrificed for the advancement of the great central truths of the Christian faith which they believed essential to the welfare of society and the salvation of men, and for the defence of those particular views which, accepting the Word of God as of supreme authority in matters of religious belief and practice, they have conscientiously held.

In the year 1780 the two Baptist churches in Boston were connected with the Warren Association, — an association of Baptist churches formed at Warren, R. I. in 1767, and embracing "all but five of the regular Baptist

churches in Rhode Island, all in eastern Massachusetts, and several in the southern part of New Hampshire." In 1811 this association, covering so much territory, contained sixty churches. In that year it was voted by delegates from the churches in eastern Massachusetts to form the Boston Association. At its first session in 1812 twenty-four churches were represented, ranging from Templeton, Mass., to New Boston, N. H., from Newton to Haverhill and Marblehead. As the churches increased in number, the more distant ones dropped off to form new associations, — the Worcester, the Old Colony, the Salem, etc.; until in 1848 the Boston Association was again divided into the Boston North and the Boston South, the dividing line going through the heart of the city. These two associations, covering a circle of territory with Boston as a centre, and a radius of eight or ten miles, now contain seventy-nine churches with an aggregate membership of 19,028. The two little Boston churches, organized prior to 1780, are found at the expiration of the century to have been multiplied by thirty-nine and a half in number, and by one hundred in respect to members. Or, if we confine our view to the actual limits of Boston today, the increase has been more than fifty-fold. The larger estimate of increase — namely, one hundred-fold, which it is certainly fair to accept — is perhaps a little in excess of the rate of increase which the denomination has had in the whole country during the last hundred years. There could hardly have been more than 25,000 Baptists in the United States in 1780, according to the most generous estimate; and the statistics of 1880 represent the denomination of regular Baptists as numbering 2,296,327 members. It may be hoped that the Baptist churches in Boston give evidence of a corresponding increase in culture, wealth, social influence, moral and spiritual life; in fact, in everything which goes to make up the power and adds to the efficiency of a church of Christ.

To estimate properly the progress of a religious denomination it is not enough to consider the mere multiplication of numbers, for great numbers may sometimes be an element of weakness rather than of strength, and increasing proportions may be no certain indication of a larger spiritual life. The progress of a denomination is seen especially, first, in the progress of the principles for which it stands; and, secondly, in the nature of the enterprises which it inaugurates and carries forward. With reference to the first point, this is not, of course, the proper place for any discussion. It will be sufficient to say that the Baptists of Boston, as elsewhere and always, have been the earnest advocates of religious liberty, — meaning thereby freedom of conscience, the unquestioned right of private judgment, and the separation of Church and State, — and also of a regenerated church-membership which is a vital part of their polity; and that they have borne no inconsiderable part in securing the more general acceptance of these principles among Christian citizens. It will be well, however, to look briefly at the second point, and consider the character of some of the enterprises which have engaged the attention of Boston Baptists, as indicative of their progressive spirit.

Previous to 1800 the Baptists of this country had done little or nothing to extend the knowledge of Christianity beyond their own borders. In this respect, however, they did not differ from other denominations of Christians. It was not until 1810 that the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, the first and largest of American missionary societies, was organized. The Baptists were few in number, for the most part in humble circumstances, and oppressed with disabilities, so that their little available strength was largely consumed for home support and advancement. A few scattered contributions had been forwarded to Rev. Dr. Carey, the pioneer missionary of the English Baptists at Serampore. In 1806 and 1807 he acknowledged the receipt of six thousand dollars from America. Another has said that the Baptists of America "were waiting for that Providential touch, as of the rod of Moses on the rock in Horeb, to which the gushing waters would come." That Providential touch was felt in the conversion of the Judsons to Baptist views, and their appeal from the distant East to those whose faith they had been led to adopt, to come to their support. When the ship "Tartar" arrived at Boston in January, 1813, bringing the unexpected tidings from the Judsons, and like unexpected tidings from Rev. Luther Rice, — who had been ordained at the same time with Mr. Judson, had sailed for India under appointment of the American Board in another ship, and had also become a Baptist during the voyage by the independent study of the Scriptures, — it was looked upon as a divine call summoning the people to immediate and united action. Boston welcomed the call and responded with alacrity in the formation of "The Baptist Society for Propagating the Gospel in India and other Foreign Parts," of which Thomas Baldwin and Daniel Sharp were chosen president and secretary. Other societies were formed at other centres, and all were united in 1814 in the "General Missionary Convention" for prosecuting the work of foreign missions. Rev. Adoniram Judson, Jr., was formally appointed their first missionary, and the denomination entered upon its sublime work of faith, and took the first step in obedience to the great commission of its risen Lord. The Convention was to meet once in three years, and the board at first had its seat in Philadelphia. At the fourth meeting, however, measures were instituted which resulted, in 1826, in the transfer of the seat of management to Boston. The Baptists here accepted the solemn trust, and for fifty-four years have administered it with distinguishing wisdom and fidelity. The American Baptist Missionary Union, the name by which the society is now known, is, indeed, almost a national society, receiving its support from States east, north, and west, and expending during the past year $290,000 in its work; yet its support and its prosperity have been dependent in no small degree upon the fostering care and generous sympathies of the men and the churches to whose immediate supervision its interests have been committed. They have not only given to it their wisdom in the direction of its operations, but again and again in times of emergency have taken its burdens and made them their own, accepting them as from the Lord, and bearing them cheerfully

for His name's sake. They have been abundantly compensated, not only by the consciousness of duty done, but by the enlargement and success of the work, there being now 162 American Baptist missionaries laboring under the direction of the Missionary Union, and 1,052 native preachers, and 85,308 living members of organized churches.

Another object in which the Baptists of Boston have been especially interested during the present century, has been the work of ministerial education. The first quarter of the nineteenth century was distinguished by the activity of Christians of different names in this country in making provision for an educated ministry. In 1808 the Theological Seminary in Andover, Mass., was founded; in 1810 the Theological Seminary of the Dutch Reformed Church in New Brunswick, N. J.; in 1812 the Theological Seminary in Princeton, N. J.; and in 1814 the Theological Seminary in Bangor, Me. The Baptists caught the spirit of the time, and, acknowledging the necessity of special training for those who were to be the spiritual guides of the people and the leaders of religious thought, moved forward to meet it. It is, indeed, true, in the language of Rev. Dr. Sprague, that "The Baptists, as a denomination, have always attached little importance to human learning as a qualification for the ministry, *in comparison with* those higher, though not miraculous, spiritual gifts which they believe it the province of the Holy Ghost to impart; and some of them, it must be acknowledged, have gone to the extreme of looking upon high intellectual culture in a minister as rather a hindrance than a help to the success of his labors."[1] He very justly adds, however, "The Baptists have had less credit as the friends and patrons of learning than they have deserved."

The First Baptist Church in Boston was compelled to select its first pastors from such material as it had at hand, generally choosing some godly man from its own number. Such were Thomas Gould, John Russell, Isaac Hull, and Ellis Callender. The second pastor, John Russell, was a shoemaker by trade, and probably, like the Apostle Paul, thought it an honor, and also found it a necessity, to work at his trade after entering the ministry. He is described as "a wise and worthy man," who, making no pretensions to scholarship, "plainly spoke what he did know." His humble calling and meagre preparation for the ministry were sometimes made subjects for ridicule by his educated neighbors, and he was exhorted to "stick to his last." Having written an account of the trials of his church, and been so unwise as to venture into print with it, it was spoken of as a pamphlet which "a wedder-dropped shoemaker had stitched up." A Mr. Willard moralized sagely in this way: "Truly, if Goodman Russell be a fit man for a minister, we have but fooled ourselves in building colleges and instructing children in learning."

When, however, the church had it in its power to secure for its pulpit those who had enjoyed larger advantages, it was not slow to do it. Its sixth and seventh pastors were Elisha Callender and Jeremiah Condy, both of

[1] Historical Introduction to *Annals of American Baptist Pulpit*, p. xv.

whom were graduates of Harvard College. They served the church from 1718 to 1764. The eighth pastor was Dr. Stillman, who "had received a good classical education, and studied theology under his pastor, the Rev. Mr. Hart," of Charleston, S. C. This method, namely, of private study with some prominent pastor, was often resorted to, even after graduation from college, for special theological training. It was the best method possible at the time, but was felt to be utterly inadequate. In 1814, at the third annual meeting of the Boston Association of Baptist churches, there was formed the Massachusetts Baptist Education Society, having for its object the preparation of a ministry more thoroughly qualified for its great work. This society, having changed its name to "The Northern Baptist Education Society," is still in active operation, having rendered a service of incalculable value to the churches.

Out of that educational movement begun in 1814 grew first the "Maine Literary and Theological Institution," planted in 1817 at Waterville, Me. It was subsequently called Waterville College, and more recently it has borne the name of Colby University, in honor of the late Gardner Colby, Esq., a successful Boston merchant, by whose donations its endowment has been greatly increased.

As a second direct result of that educational movement, there was founded, in 1825, the Newton Theological Institution, situated in Newton Centre, seven miles from Boston. This institution does not, indeed, belong exclusively to the Baptists of Boston, or even of Massachusetts. It has had generous friends in all parts of New England, who have contributed to its funds and promoted its prosperity. But it is not too much to say that by far the larger part of its endowment has been contributed, even as the heavy burdens of its foundation were borne, by its friends in Boston and its immediate vicinity. The names of four laymen are mentioned[1] as especially connected with the establishment of this school of sacred learning; namely, Ensign Lincoln, of the well remembered publishing house of Lincoln and Edmands; Nathaniel R. Cobb, a conscientious Christian merchant, who at the beginning of his business career solemnly adopted a plan of benevolence beginning with these words, "By the grace of God, I will never be worth more than $50,000;" Levi Farwell, who for nine years was steward of Harvard College; and Jonathan Batcheller, of Lynn, a man of whom it has been said that he "spent little on himself, and put much into the treasury of the Lord." Three of these friends of the institution contributed to its funds in the aggregate nearly sixty thousand dollars, at a time when large gifts were few, and the wealth of the denomination was small. Boston has furnished worthy successors of these liberal men, who have assisted in increasing the assets of the institution to $450,000. The Board of Trustees has been presided over for forty-five years by the following persons in succession: Rev. Daniel Sharp, D.D., Rev. Baron Stow, D.D.,

[1] *Historical Address* by President Alvah Hovey, D.D., at the Fiftieth Anniversary of Newton Theological Institution.

Gardner Colby, Esq., and Hon. J. Warren Merrill. The prosperity and present efficiency of this honored school of the denomination are due in no small degree to the wisdom and generosity of its representatives in Boston and vicinity.

It is not necessary to speak of the general activities of the Baptist churches in this city, or the numerous channels through which their ever increasing life has flowed. Those channels have been such as the life of spiritual religion will ever make for itself, and the forms of service have been such as are everywhere born of the genius of the gospel of Christ. The important work of Christian benevolence and home evangelization, in all its departments, has enlisted the practical sympathies of these churches. They have reached out the hand of help to the destitute and the oppressed of every name, — the unfortunate, the inebriate, the struggling pioneer of the West, the unenlightened freedman of the South, the mariner who lands at our port, and the immigrant who seeks a home on our shores. They have inculcated by precept and example those principles of righteousness on which the peace and good morals of society depend. They have earnestly proclaimed those fundamental truths of Christianity which are the basis of the highest morality as well as of immortal hope; assured that if men are made true citizens of God's spiritual kingdom, they cannot fail to be virtuous, peace-loving, law-abiding citizens under human government. In seeking to serve God devotedly, they have rendered the best service to the city and the Commonwealth. That the work of these churches has been marred by much weakness and imperfection is, alas! too true; but it is hoped that they have been sufficiently true to their holy faith to show some resemblance to the apostolic model, and to assist in promoting the public weal.

There are two enterprises which the Baptists have put in successful operation in this city, which may perhaps be called Baptist "notions." The Tremont Temple enterprise, in its present large proportions, grew out of a determination to establish a free church in Boston, — a church where "all persons, whether rich or poor, without distinction of color or condition," could be free to enjoy the public ministry of the gospel. The prime mover in the enterprise was Timothy Gilbert, a man of strong character and positive convictions, who may be said to have been born a reformer, and who so earnestly identified himself with the Antislavery movement, that he won to himself from the lips of a slave-hunter the title, "*the grandest abolitionist in Boston.*" The church was organized in 1839 under the name of the First Free Church. After worshipping in various places, the Tremont Theatre, a large building opposite the Tremont House, was purchased and fitted up as a place of worship. Mr. Gilbert found, in Rev. Nathaniel Colver, D.D., the first pastor of the church, a man of like spirit with himself, of tremendous energy, and without fear, who "snuffed the battle from afar," and generally succeeded in bringing it near. He remained as pastor twelve years. The property was burned in 1853, and immediately restored. The church finding itself unable to carry so large a property, an act of incorporation was

secured in 1857 for a society known as the Evangelical Baptist Benevolent and Missionary Society, which, composed of corporate members and delegates from the Baptist churches of the city, holds the property for the benefit of the free church worshipping in it, and is to devote whatever income may at any time be derived from it to benevolent and missionary work in the city. The building, which is centrally located, has become, in accordance with the noble design of the founder of the enterprise, "the Stranger's Sabbath Home." It has been made also the headquarters of the various denominational societies located in Boston. It was again destroyed by fire in August, 1879, and has been rebuilt during the year, and now contains one of the most complete and elegant auditories in the city.

The Baptist Social Union of Boston is an association of laymen, formed in 1864, for the purpose of a more intimate acquaintance between members of the different churches, and for the consideration of topics of common practical interest. Its meetings are held monthly, and have uniformly been sources of great enjoyment and profit. This union has done much to preserve the unity and fellowship of the churches, and to stimulate their active benevolence, and guide it in wise directions. Its growth and prosperity for the sixteen years of its existence contain the promise of permanent usefulness. Other unions, similar to this, with perhaps slight modifications, have been formed in other cities and in other denominations; but to the Baptist Social Union of Boston belongs the honor of being the parent of them all.

Such is the shadowy outline of a history which has been full of earnest toil, patient and willing sacrifice, and heroic achievement. These churches, holding firmly to the supreme authority of the Word of God, and with equal firmness to the independence of the individual church, and the freedom of the individual conscience, acknowledging allegiance to no creed of human origin however venerable, and bound together only by the gossamer threads of voluntary association, have remained throughout the century substantially one with themselves, and one with their historic faith. Not one of them has departed from the common faith, or broken with its fellows. Grateful to God for the harmony and progress of the past, they anticipate the future with unwavering faith in the truths which the fathers held, in the Christ whom the fathers honored, and in the ultimate triumph of that kingdom which is "righteousness, and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost."

Henry W. Kings.

CHAPTER IX.

THE METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH: ITS ORIGIN, GROWTH, AND OFFSHOOTS IN SUFFOLK COUNTY.

BY THE REV. DANIEL DORCHESTER, D.D.

"Taedet me populi hujusce φιλοξενοῦ, ita me urbanitate sua divexant et persequuntur. Non patiuntur me esse solum. E rure veniunt invisentes clerici; me revertentes in rus trahunt. Cogor hanc Angliam contemplari, etiam antiquâ amoeniorem; et nequeo non exclamare, O fortunata regio!" — *From a letter written in Boston, Oct. 5, 1736, by the Rev. Charles Wesley to his brother John, then in Savannah, Ga.*

THE War of Independence divides the history of the original Church of England communion in Boston, as in all the older portions of the country, into two strongly contrasted periods. Before that event all American Episcopalians were under the jurisdiction of an English bishop, and were considered an integral part of the National Church. Even the lay preachers sent over by John Wesley, while they carried the gospel into many localities where the Church of England had no preachers, and gathered into religious societies multitudes of converts who were of dissenting or even foreign birth, were still so loyal to their mother that, as late as the year 1773, on holding their first conference in Philadelphia, the entire number present (ten) agreed to the following rules, to wit: —

First, that each would "*Strictly avoid administering the ordinances of Baptism and the Lord's Supper;*" and, secondly, that they would "*Earnestly exhort all the people among whom they labored, — particularly in Maryland and Virginia, — to attend the Church and to receive the ordinances there.*"

The outbreak of the war was naturally more disorganizing to this communion than to any of the others. It being the duty of every rector publicly to pray for the king and the royal family, the continuance of public worship according to the Book of Common Prayer was impossible. In this state of things the majority of the Episcopal clergy esteemed it alike their duty and interest to flee the country, where they could only be objects of popular suspicion or hate, and wait the further unfoldments of Providence. The war over, and its issue irrevocably sealed by the treaty which ac-

knowledged the independence of the American States, the necessity for ecclesiastical re-organization was forced upon the communicants and ministers still attached to the Episcopal order and to the forms of the Anglican Church.

Two independent American churches were the result, to wit: the Methodist Episcopal Church, organized in 1784, and the Protestant Episcopal Church, organized in 1789. Each was constituted after the Anglican model, with a ministry including bishops, presbyters, and deacons; each adopted, with modifications, the Articles of Religion of the Church of England and the ritual contained in the Book of Common Prayer. The more patriotic and religiously-aggressive elements of the old communion, strengthened by large accessions won by the lay-ministry before and during the war, crystallized into the earlier of the two new churches; the more conservative, wealthy, and tradition-loving elements into the latter. If the modifications embodied in the recension of the Thirty-nine Articles and the Prayer-book adopted by the Methodist Episcopal Church are more in the interest of doctrinal and liturgical freedom than those secured by the Protestant Episcopal Church, the history of the time, and particularly the history of King's Chapel, Boston, and Dr. White's *Proposed Prayer-Book*, shows that the fault was in the English bishops and not in the constituents of the new organization. Both churches are the natural and filial representatives of the Anglican mother; and, taken together, undoubtedly constitute a more important factor in the religious life of the country than ever that mother did in the period of colonial dependency.

The "Holy Club" of the University of Oxford was formed in the autumn of 1729. Seven years later, on Sept. 24, 1736, one of the most distinguished of its original members, the Rev. Charles Wesley, landed in Boston. At that time Mr. Wesley was a missionary to Georgia and secretary to the governor of the colony, General Oglethorpe. Being in somewhat impaired health, he was commissioned by the governor to bear important dispatches to the home government in London. In consequence of the unseaworthy condition of the ship on which he embarked, the captain put in at the port of Boston; and thus the visit of the man who may be called the first Methodist Episcopal clergyman who ever preached in this city, was unforeseen and involuntary. Though quite ill, Mr. Wesley preached in King's Chapel and in Christ Church, received visits from various suburban clergymen, and celebrated, in a lively letter to his brother, both the remarkable hospitality of the people and the beauty of the adjacent country. He re-embarked for England October 25, the same year.

Four years later another member of the same club of Oxford Methodists, George Whitefield, a priest of the Church of England, and therefore entitled to be called a Methodist Episcopalian, appeared in Boston. The story of his sojourn has been told in the second volume of this History. Twenty thousand people heard his farewell sermon on the Common, where fifty years later, under the preaching of Jesse Lee, another Methodist Episco-

palian, the permanent planting of Methodism was effected. In his advent and in his departure he was a common sharer[1] with the Wesleys in whatever opprobrium was then attached to the name of Methodist.

From this date until his death, in 1770, this second Methodist Episcopal minister — the forerunner of the Methodist Episcopal Church — was an important element in the religious history of Boston. He visited the town again and again, as the reader has seen. His labors here, as elsewhere, in his grand itinerations, were preparing the way for those heroic successors who have made the planting and growth of the Methodist Episcopal Church a marvel to students of American church history.

In the same storms through which Whitefield was borne on his final passage to America, the Revs. Richard Boardman and Joseph Pillmore, the first preachers sent by Wesley, were tossed on their tempestuous voyage. Boardman — the first superintendent of Wesley's missionaries to our shores, a man of strong understanding and amiable spirit — came to Boston in May, 1772. A place of worship was obtained, converts made, and a society organized; but it did not long exist. The political excitements of those pre-Revolutionary years embarrassed religious movements. By inflaming the people, they supplanted religious thought and action.

In the autumn of 1784, the Rev. William Black, "an English Wesleyan preacher, eminent for talents and character," preached a few times in Boston. After a visit to the Conference in Baltimore, he returned and resumed his labors here. Denied access to the pulpits, he preached in a chamber at the North End; then in a chamber at the South End. At both places the floors settled under the crowd, and occasioned alarm. Then he preached in Dr. Stillman's (Baptist) church; then in the North Latin School-house; then in the Sandemanian Chapel; and finally, on his last Sabbath, in the New North Church of the estimable Dr. Eliot. Arrangements made for a successor failed, and the converts joined other churches.

In 1787 the Rev. Freeborn Garretson, fresh from the founding of Methodism in Halifax, N. S., passed through Boston. He found some who had been members of the society formed by Boardman fifteen years before. After preaching several times in private houses, he left, purposing to return the following year. Detained, however, by the rapidly-spreading work in the Middle States, he did not come again until 1790. A descendant from an old Maryland family, connected by marriage with the Chancellor Livingston family of New York, a slaveholder and man of affairs, on his conversion to Methodism, he emancipated his slaves for Christ's sake, and became a conspicuous leader in the itinerant hosts. Cherishing his interest in Boston, while superintendent of the rising societies on the Hudson, he visited this town, and on Sunday evening, July 4, preached in the church formerly occupied by Dr. Mather. Engaging a place for future services, he went to Providence, meeting on his way one destined to achieve the distinction of

[1] Whitefield was then in full sympathy with the Wesleys. His break with them on account of Calvinism occurred after this visit to Boston.

organizing the first permanent Methodist Episcopal churches in Boston and New England.

Ten miles from Providence the two itinerants, habited in the simplicity of their order, with those invariable symbols the now obsolete saddle-bags, unexpectedly and joyfully met. The one reports his reconnoitring tour, and hastens on to his immense district on the Hudson; and the other unfolds his plans, and advances to the metropolis of the old Puritan commonwealth.

It was beneath the famous Elm which until lately was a conspicuous object on our Common, that, at six o'clock on Sunday evening, July 11, 1790, upon a rude table, a man of powerful frame and of "serene but shrewd countenance" took his stand. Four persons approached, and curiously gazed while he sang. Kneeling, he prayed with a fervor unknown in the Puritan pulpits, attracting crowds of promenaders from the shady walks. Three thousand persons drank in his flowing thoughts, as from a pocket-Bible, "without notes," he proclaimed a free salvation. At first sententiously, then with a variety of beautiful images, then with broad discussion, then with tender pathos, he moved the thronging crowd. "It was agreed," said one who heard him, "that such a man had not visited New England since the days of Whitefield. I heard him again, and thought I could follow him to the ends of the earth." Such was the Rev. Jesse Lee's first appearance before a Boston gathering.

The peculiar effect of early Methodist preaching was not, however, wholly due either to the eloquence, or the manner, or the spiritual power of the preachers. It was largely owing to the adaptation of the religious views which they presented to existing conditions in the minds of their hearers. Said an eminent Congregational divine: —

"There was evidently an aptitude in the public mind to receive the Methodist faith and form of worship. Nor is it difficult to show how this came about. Old Orthodoxy, tinctured with Arminianism, and cooled down to a lukewarm temperature in its delivery from the desk, had become the characteristic of Sabbath-day instructions in many pulpits, as it had been prior to the Great Awakening in 1740; and nothing could have been more favorable to the success of an earnest, loud-spoken ministry. In his doctrinal teaching Jesse Lee, the pioneer of that denomination in these parts, suited such as were of Arminian tendencies; in his fervent style of address he was acceptable to many warm-hearted Calvinists tired of dull preaching. What with both of these adaptations to the wants of the people, no wonder that Methodism had a rapid growth. Something of the kind was inevitable. The wild enthusiasm of the Quakers had long since disappeared, and their numbers were diminishing. The martyr spirit which animated the first generation of Baptists had subsided with the removal of their civil disabilities, and their religious zeal suffered a proportional decline. If Jesse Lee had not come into Massachusetts, some one else, pressed in spirit, like Paul at Athens 'when he saw the city wholly given to idolatry,' would have found utterance, and would have had followers." [1]

[1] *Historical Sketch of the Congregational Churches in Massachusetts*, by the Rev. Joseph S. Clark, D.D., pp. 226, 227.

Jesse Lee was a man of uncommon colloquial gifts, with a fascinating address and ready wit. His rare physical, intellectual, and spiritual powers were united with

> "An unconquerable will,
> And courage never to submit or yield."

A scion of an old Virginia family, early trained in the Episcopal Church, a zealous convert to Wesleyanism, he went forth as an itinerant and founded societies from Florida to New Brunswick. At the age of thirty-one he was commissioned to establish on the soil of the Puritans the Methodist Episcopal Church, — the first religious body which had effected a national organization in the United States. The following year he reached Boston, and halted not until he saw this denomination established in all the Eastern States.

During the week after he preached on the Common, Lee visited Lynn, Salem, Newburyport, and Portsmouth, and returned to Boston. On the next Sunday, being still excluded from the churches, he preached again on the Common to 3,000 persons; during the week in private houses, and once in a vacant Baptist church; and, on the third Sunday, again on the Common to 5,000 persons. Then he returned to his widely extended field in Rhode Island and Connecticut.

On the 13th of November he was again in Boston. The weather was cold, shutting him out of his leafy temple, and the hearts of the people were colder still. Then commenced a series of labors, struggles, defeats, and reverses, which would have made a less indomitable spirit quail. This princely man, pronounced by Dr. Thomas Coke to be "one of the ablest preachers he had ever heard in Europe or America," who preached the gospel from the St. Mary's to the St. John's with a success unequalled since the days of Whitefield, and who was an acceptable chaplain to Congress for several years, received no notice from any Boston minister, nor was allowed access to any audience room. Months passed, almost two years, with occasional visits and close inquiry. Meanwhile, though unsuccessful, he was still intent. Societies were formed in Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Connecticut, and Rhode Island. Lynn opened her doors and her heart, organized a church and erected a chapel; but Boston remained closed. Then preachers from Lynn, under Lee's superintendence, visited Boston, and the sterile soil began to yield fruit.

On July 13, 1792, the first Methodist class was formed in Boston, at the house of Mr. Samuel Burrill, on Sheafe Street, at the North End. Fifteen members were soon after reported to the Conference, and the Rev. Jeremiah Cosden was appointed preacher. A gentleman of fortune and educated for the bar, he left the law for the gospel, and abandoned the courts to become an itinerant. A school-house at the North End was the first place of worship; then an "upper room" in the house of Mr. John Ruddock, corner of Harris and Ann (now North) streets. Here the apostolic Asbury

preached, complaining of the incommodiousness of the place, and of the noise of the "Jack Tars and boys" outside.

In 1793 the Rev. Amos G. Thompson was the preacher; in 1794 the Rev. Christopher Spry; in 1795 the Rev. John Harper, late from the West Indies, and father of Chancellor Harper, of South Carolina.

On August 28, 1795, the corner-stone of the first Methodist Episcopal church was laid by the Rev. Jesse Lee. The house went slowly up, and was dedicated May 15, 1796, the sermon being given by the Rev. George Pickering. It was situated in Ingraham's Yard, subsequently Methodist Alley, now Hanover Avenue. This was then a very respectable locality. Dr. Eliot's New Brick Church was only two hundred feet distant, and Ann Street and other adjacent streets were occupied by the residences of people of the higher social rank. This first edifice was a small, plain building measuring thirty-six by forty-six feet, rough and unfinished within, and benches without backs served for pews. Even in this condition it was heavily encumbered with debt, for the forty members were all poor. In this state it was occupied until 1800, when through the assistance of Lee in the Middle States, and with a little help from the clergy and citizens of Boston, it was completed. But the struggle was hard; and even when finished the house was severely plain. The alley then had no side-walks. The main floor was two steps above the street, and the outside door opened directly into the aisles, and to the right and left stairs led into the galleries, one of which was occupied by males and the other by females. A stove stood in front of the altar. Opposite the pulpit were the singers' seats, — and the old church was famous for good singing. Here the society worshipped until the erection of the more spacious edifice on Bennet Street, when the old church was occupied by the Boston Port Society, until the Seaman's Bethel in the North Square was completed, in which the Rev. Edward T. Taylor exercised his wonderful ministry.

The early worshippers in the Methodist Alley Church suffered many petty annoyances. Rude disturbers of their worship were thought to have been incited to unmanly acts by others who screened themselves. At last legal protection was secured through the influence of Mr. William W. Motley, a gentleman of culture, who had become a Methodist.

The good influence of this church was widely felt at the North End. From 1796 to 1828 it was a centre of moral light and heat. The voices of all the eminent ministers of the Methodist Episcopal Church were heard there. Bishops Asbury, George, and McKendree, Revs. George Pickering, John Broadhead, Daniel Ostrander, Thomas F. Sargeant, Peter Jayne, Samuel Merwin, Daniel Webb, Martin Ruter, D.D., Elijah Hedding, D.D., Enoch Mudge, Timothy Merritt, and President Wilbur Fisk, D.D., are some of the notable ones. The Rev. John Newland Maffitt preached in this house to crowded audiences, many persons climbing in at the windows to hear him. Among the laymen of the earlier period were Samuel Burrill, Thomas Green, Elijah Phinney Lewis, Uriah Tufts, Jacob Hawkins, Samuel

Mills, Abram Ingersol, James Johnson, Colonel Amos Binney, and William W. Motley.

At the end of fourteen years the membership of the church was two hundred and fifty-seven, and it was resolved (March 3, 1806) to erect another chapel in another part of the city. On the 19th of November following the Bromfield-Street Church was dedicated, the sermon being delivered by the Rev. Samuel Merwin. Its foundations contained a block of hewn stone from Plymouth Rock, which is still there. Was it a symbol of the engrafting of the Methodist bough into the stock of the old New-England order, or of the absorption of that into the larger life and growth of Methodism?

The erection of this edifice was a bold movement, and purely aggressive. Those who undertook it were only just relieved from the heavy embarrassments occasioned by the completion of the Alley church. But the new enterprise involved them more deeply. The sale of the pews was very limited; the times soon became very unfavorable: the Berlin and Milan decrees, the Embargo and Non-Intercourse acts, paralyzed commerce and industry. Boston felt the shock severely. Years of painful struggles followed. Contributions were sought all over the land. The General Conference and Annual Conferences were appealed to. The Middle States, and even Charleston, South Carolina, sent aid. The sagacious plans and large public influence of Colonel Amos Binney and Mr. John Clark contributed much to the final solution of the problem.

This crisis passed, the experimental period of Methodism in Boston was over. The next twenty years was a period of steady and healthy growth. The church extended its influence, and acquired character and respect. Colonel Amos Binney, a trustee and steward, was a merchant, and for a dozen years the United States Navy agent in Boston, and stood side by side with leading citizens; John Clark was an enterprising citizen; George Sutherland, a trustee and class-leader, was a Scotchman by birth, always radiant with sunshine, and a goldsmith by trade; Thomas Bagnall, class-leader and trustee, was a man of literary taste; Mrs. Sarah Hawes, a niece of Governor Hancock, an eminently consistent and elevated Christian, received into the church by the Rev. Elijah Hedding, deserves mention as the "Elect Lady." Besides these, Thomas Patten, a member of the Massachusetts Legislature, David Patten, father of the late Rev. David Patten, Jr., D.D., of precious memory, and William True, father of the late Rev. Charles K. True, D.D., an honored alumnus of Harvard College, are a few of many worthy names of this period, conspicuous for devotion to the church. Isaac Rich and Jacob Sleeper, gentlemen of rare excellences, belong to a later period, of ampler opportunities, which they have filled and honored with noble charities and deeds.

These two churches were favored with frequent revivals, and the membership increased from 259 in 1806 to 688 in 1830. In 1827 the church in the Alley felt the need of a larger and better edifice. A lot was purchased on Bennet Street, and a new church was dedicated Sept. 18, 1828, the Rev.

Stephen Martindale delivering the sermon. Forty-three pews were sold, and the only surviving purchaser is the venerable Micah Dyer, of the present Tremont-Street Church. With these two more sightly edifices as outward signs, the cause of Methodism moved forward under a strong impulse, and other churches were organized.

The first Methodist church in Dorchester was formed in 1817, and was due to the influence of Mr. Anthony Otheman,[1] a French Huguenot, who was one of the fruits of this denomination in Boston. In 1818 the first Methodist church was formed in Charlestown. They purchased the wooden structure on High Street, built by the Baptists and subsequently occupied by the Unitarians. In 1818 a Methodist society was organized at Chelsea Point, now Winthrop. In 1826 the May-Street, now Revere-Street, Church was organized for the colored people, and the Rev. Samuel Snowden, highly esteemed for twenty-five years by citizens of all classes, was their pastor.

Two periods of church colonizing have since marked the history of the Methodist Episcopal Church within the present limits of Suffolk County. The first was from 1834 to 1853, in which the following fourteen churches were organized: In 1834, the Church-Street, now the Peoples', Church; in 1835, after several unsuccessful attempts previously, the First Methodist Episcopal, now the Broadway, Church in South Boston; in 1837, the North Russell-Street Church; in 1839, the First Methodist Episcopal, now the Winthrop-Street, Church in Roxbury; and the First Methodist Episcopal, now the Walnut-Street, Church in Chelsea; in 1841, the Richmond-Street Church, and the First Methodist Episcopal, now the Meridian-Street, Church in East Boston; in 1842, the "Odeon" Society; in 1846, the Canton-Street, now the Tremont-Street, Church; in 1847, the Second Methodist Episcopal, now the Monument-Square, Church in Charlestown; in 1850, the Second Methodist Episcopal, now the Appleton, Church in Dorchester; in 1852, the Mount-Bellingham Church in Chelsea, and the German Church in Roxbury; and in 1853, the Bennington-Street, now the Saratoga-Street, Church in East Boston.

In the meantime new conditions affected the population at the North End. They were felt soon after 1840, and became more apparent in the next ten years, influencing unfavorably all the Protestant churches. In 1849 the Richmond-Street and the Bennet-Street churches united, and purchased the large and elegant edifice of Dr. Robbins's Unitarian Society on Hanover Street. The North Russell-Street Church held its position until 1865, when it removed to Grace Church, on Temple Street. In 1873 the Hanover-Street Church relinquished its field and united with the Grace Church, but retained its title as the First Methodist Episcopal Church in Boston.

In sixteen years — from 1853 to 1869 — only two Methodist churches were organized, — one at Jamaica Plain, in 1859, and the Dorchester-Street Church, in South Boston, in 1860.

[1] Father of the Revs. Bartholomew and Edward Otheman.

From 1869 to 1878 is the second colonizing period, in which the following ten churches were organized, most of them the fruits of the Boston Methodist City Mission and Church-Extension Society: In 1869 the Highland Church and the Ruggles-Street Church in Roxbury; in 1871, the Washington-Village Church in South Boston, and the Broadway Church in Chelsea; in 1872, the church at Allston; in 1873, the church at Roslindale; in 1874, the church at Harrison Square; in 1876, the Mount-Pleasant Church; in 1877, the Eggleston-Square Church; and in 1878, the Monroe Mission Church on Charlestown Neck.

Two African Methodist Episcopal churches — the Zion Church on North Russell Street, and the Bethel Church on Charles Street, now jointly numbering about 500 members — were organized in 1836 and 1839 respectively.

Two secessions from the Methodist Episcopal Church in Boston have occurred, — the Protestant Methodist, in 1830, and the True Wesleyan, in 1842–43; but the churches formed by the retiring bodies were small, and existed only a few years.

Among the tangible and conspicuous results of Boston Methodism, several demand mention: —

1. The first School of Theology of the Methodist Episcopal Church had its inception in Boston in 1839, was organized a little later in Concord, New Hampshire, and removed to Boston in 1867. It has graduated over four hundred young men.

2. The Boston University, with which the School of Theology united in 1871, is an outgrowth of the Methodist Episcopal Church. It was founded by Isaac Rich, Jacob Sleeper, and Lee Claflin; Mr. Rich bequeathing to it his large estate. It comprises colleges of liberal arts, music, agriculture, theology, law, and medicine, in which are over five hundred students. Under the presidency of the Rev. William F. Warren, D.D., LL.D., it has attained the highest rank. Women are admitted to all its departments, and it is eminently progressive and catholic in all its features.

3. *The Zion's Herald*, the oldest newspaper of the denomination, was founded in Boston in 1823. Its successive editors have been John R. Cotton, Barber Badger, G. W. H. Forbes, Benjamin Jones, Revs. Shipley W. Wilson, Aaron Lummus, Mr. William C. Brown, Revs. Timothy Merritt, Samuel O. Wright, Benjamin Kingsbury, Abel Stevens, LL.D., Daniel Wise, D.D., Erastus O. Haven, D.D., LL.D., Nelson E. Cobleigh, D.D., Gilbert Haven, LL.D., and Bradford K. Pierce, D.D. It has a circulation of 15,000 copies.

4. The Wesleyan Association, a corporation formed in 1831, consisting of laymen, own and publish the *Zion's Herald*. In 1870 they completed and occupied the elegant Wesleyan Building on Bromfield Street, in which are the offices of the *Zion's Herald*, the Wesleyan Hall, and the general headquarters of the denomination in New England.

5. The Methodist book-store, now in the Wesleyan Building, has existed over forty years, and has been conducted successively by Dexter S. King,

Strong & Broadhead, Wait, Pierce, & Co., Charles H. Pierce, and, since 1851, by the present efficient agent, James P. Magee, under whose administration its annual sales have increased from thirty thousand dollars in 1850 to eighty thousand dollars at the present time.

6. In 1872 Boston became an Episcopal residence, and a fine parsonage was purchased, on Rutland Street, at the South End. The Rt. Rev. Randolph S. Foster, D.D., LL.D., is the New England Bishop.

7. The Methodist Social Union, a body of laymen and ministers, meets monthly in the Wesleyan Hall, for the promotion of church life and fellowship.

8. The Boston Methodist Preachers' Meeting, a live aggressive body, for the discussion of church questions and general improvement, meets every Monday morning in the Wesleyan Hall.

9. The New-England Methodist Historical Society, whose headquarters are in the Wesleyan Building on Bromfield Street; Hon. William Claflin, President, Willard S. Allen, Librarian, and the Rev. Daniel Dorchester, D.D., Historiographer.

10. The Woman's Foreign Missionary Society of the Methodist Episcopal Church was here organized in the year 1869. It now covers with its branches nearly the whole country, and raises between seventy and eighty thousand dollars a year for the support of female missionaries and school work in different parts of the world. Its monthly organ, *The Heathen Woman's Friend*, edited by Mrs. William F. Warren, with a circulation of twenty thousand copies, has been from the beginning published in this city.

STATISTICS OF THE METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCHES IN BOSTON, AND SUFFOLK COUNTY.

Year.	Localities and Churches.	Ministers.	Members.
1790	Boston	Jesse Lee	...
1800	Boston	Thomas F. Sargeant	72
1820	Boston	David Kilburn, Benjamin R. Hoyt	619
	Dorchester	Benjamin Hazleton, Jotham Horton	19
	Charlestown	Wilbur Fisk, D.D.	
			638
1840	Boston, Bennet Street	James Porter, D.D.	509
	,, Bromfield Street	Stephen Lovell	475
	,, Church Street	Thomas C. Pierce	268
	,, North Russell Street	Jefferson Hascal, D.D.	316
	,, Mariner's Church	Edward T. Taylor	...
	,, South Boston	Ziba B. C. Dunham	103
	Roxbury	Henry B. Skinner	103
	Dorchester	Luman Boyden	129
	Charlestown	Epaphras Kibbe	133
	Chelsea	John S. Springer	
			2,036

STATISTICS OF THE METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCHES. — *Continued.*

LOCALITIES AND CHURCHES. 1860.	PASTORS.	Members.	Probationers.	Local Preachers.	CHURCH PROPERTY.				SUNDAY SCHOOLS.			
					Churches.	Value.	Parsonages.	Value.	Schools.	Officers and Teachers	Scholars.	Volumes in Library.
BOSTON.												
First Church, Hanover Street	William C. High	432	30	2	1	$75,000			2	58	425	800
Bromfield Street	William F. Warren, D.D., LL.D.	430	13	1	1	75,000	1	$8,000	1	35	224	1,500
Church Street	Isaac J. P. Collyer	300	30	2	1	30,000			1	37	315	564
North Russell Street	John W. Dadmun	302	23	...	1	15,000	...		1	40	283	950
Hedding Church	Henry W. Warren, D.D.	193	10	...	1	15,000	...		1	26	238	1,000
Revere Street	Supplied	51	9	3	1	3,000	...		1	16	64	132
Centenary Church	Ralph W. Allen	125	6	2	1	6,000	...		1	30	270	600
Meridian Street	Samuel Tupper	290	60	...	1	18,000	..		1	41	336	710
Bennington Street	Gershom F. Cox	151	18	..	.		...		1	38	290	983
Mariner's Church	Edward T. Taylor / John W. F. Barnes	.....	...	.	.					..		
Total, Old Boston		2,274	199	10	8	$237,000	1	$8,000	10	321	2,445	7,239
Roxbury, Warren Street	Fales H. Newhall, D.D.	256	20	3	1	17,000	.		1	43	261	700
,, Jamaica Plain	John Emory Round	19	11				..		1		25	200
,, German Church	H. Liebhout	83	31	2	1	3,500	.		1	26	135	370
Dorchester, First Church	Zachariah A. Mudge	100	...		1	5,000			1	25	125	550
Charlestown, High Street	George Bowler	167	6	1	1	10,000	..		2	29	193	410
,, Union Church	Nathan D. George	321	35		1	15,000			2	34	300	600
Total, in Present Boston		3,220	302	16	13	$287,500	1	$8,000	18	478	3,484	10,069
Chelsea, Walnut Street	Justin S. Barrows	210	26	2	1	25,000	1	2,800	2	40	300	900
Mount Bellingham Street	Willard F. Mallalieu, D.D.	151	16	.	1	21,000	.		1	36	236	925
Winthrop	John S. Day	35	3	..	1	500	...		1	15	99	365
Total, present limits of Suffolk County		3,616	347	18	16	$334,000	2	$10,800	22	569	4,119	12,259

STATISTICS OF THE METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCHES.—*Concluded.*

LOCALITIES AND CHURCHES. 1880.	Date of organization.	PASTORS.	Members.	Probationers.	Local Preachers.	CHURCH PROPERTY.				SUNDAY SCHOOLS.			
						Churches.	Value of Churches.	Parsonages.	Value of Pars'ges.	Schools.	Officers and Teachers.	Scholars.	Volumes in Library.
Old City District.													
First Church, Temple Street	1792	Samuel F. Upham, D.D.	476	42	15	1	$47,000	1	$12,000	1	43	350	900
Bromfield Street	1806	Amos B. Kendig	348	28		1	100,000	1	10,000	1	38	330	591
People's Church	1834	John W. Hamilton	250	52	6	1	70,000	1	10,000	1	45	386	950
Tremont Street	1846	William E. Huntington	256	5	2	1	150,000	1	12,000	1	34	294	1,265
Broadway	1835	Joseph H. Mansfield	370	15	4	1	65,000			1	36	408	800
Dorchester Street	1860	Nicholas T. Whitaker	194	22		1	20,000			1	35	276	500
Washington Village	1871		36	10		1	3,500			1	15	129	
Meridian Street	1841	Lewis B. Bates	325	30		1	28,000	1	5,500	1	44	456	1,300
Saratoga Street	1853	Samuel L. Gracy	415	34	1	1	30,000	1	5,000	1	50	433	950
Revere Street	1826	Thomas B. Snowden	55	8	1	1	5,000			1	6	30	
Swedish Mission	1880	Otto Anderson	15							1			
Total, Old Boston			2,740	246	29	10	$518,500	6	$54,500	11	346	3,092	7,256
Roxbury and West Roxbury District.													
Winthrop Street	1839	Andrew McKeown, D.D	223	22	1	1	45,000	1	8,000	1	34	300	1,000
German Church	1852	Frederick W. Flocken	93	4	2	1	12,000	1	3,000	1	21	98	
Highland Church	1869	Frank K. Stratton	260	54	1	1	28,000			1	26	268	470
Jamaica Plain	1859	James W. Bashford	94	14	3	1	19,000			1	11	96	275
Roslindale	1873	Joseph H. Thompson	76	2	1	1	20,000			1	25	190	500
Ruggles Street	1869	William H. Hatch	62			1	2,500			1	20	160	400
Eggleston Square	1877	D. W. Couch	57	8		1	8,000			1	20	175	
Dorchester District.													
Dorchester Church	1817	Hiram D. Weston	202	9		1	37,000			1	28	321	505
Appleton Church	1850	Edward W. Virgin	102	14	1	1	5,000			1	13	75	300
Harrison Square	1874	Lyman D. Bragg	57	8		1	8,000			1	25	125	265
Mount Pleasant	1876	Franklin Furber	95	5		1	6,000			1	33	146	275

Brighton District.													
Allston	1872	William G. Leonard	62	7		1	12,000			1	14	75	
Charlestown District.													
Trinity Church	1818	Horace W. Bolton	366	42	1	1	65,000			1	87	700	850
Monument Square	1847	James O. Knowles	335	28	1	1	40,000			1	46	398	600
Monroe Mission	1877		14	6	2					1	11	71	300
Total, Present Boston			4,838	469	42	24	$862,000	8	$65,500	26	760	6,290	12,890
Chelsea.													
Walnut Street	1839	W. F. Mallalieu, D.D.	471	23	4	1	35,000	1	6,000	1	53	541	1,000
Mount Bellingham	1852	Varnum A. Cooper	306	16		1	30,000	1	4 000	1	40	306	800
Broadway	1871	Cyrus L. Eastman	100	11						1	14	100	381
Winthrop	1818	William A. Nottage	89	3		1	15,000			1	13	340	400
Total, Suffolk County			5,804	522	46	27	$942,000	10	$75,500	30	880	7,577	15,471
AFRICAN METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCHES.													
Bethel, Charles Street	1839	William H. Hunter	294	5	3	2	$70,000			1	25	255	350
Zion, North Russell Street	1836	R. H. Dyson	200	35	4	1	30,000			1	16	150	500

COMPARATIVE PROGRESS.

Localities and Periods.	Communicants.	Church Property.				Sunday Schools.			
		Church Edifices.	Value of Churches.	Parsonages.	Value of Pars'ges.	Schools.	Scholars.	Officers and Teachers.	Volumes in Library.
Old Boston.									
1840 [1]	2,036	4				5			
1860	2,473	8	$237,000	1	$8,000	10	2,445	321	7,239
1880	2,986	10	518,500	6	54,500	11	3,092	346	7,256
Present Boston. [2]									
1840 [1]	2,036	6				8			
1860	3,522	13	287,500	1	8,000	18	3,484	478	10,069
1880	5,307	24	862,000	8	65,500	26	6,230	760	12,890
Suffolk County [2]									
1840 [1]	2,036	7				10			
1860	3,993	16	334,000	2	10,800	22	4,119	569	12,259
1880	6,326	27	942,000	10	75,500	30	7,577	880	15,471

[1] Only partial statistics for 1840 can now be obtained

[2] The same territory is included for each period.

From 1840 to 1880 the population within the present limits of Suffolk County increased 200 per cent, and the communicants of the Methodist Episcopal Church, 210 per cent. From 1860 to 1880 the population increased 40 per cent, and the communicants, 60 per cent. All this gain has been realized, notwithstanding the immense foreign additions to the population during these forty years.

Bibliographical Notes.—*A Short History of the Methodists.* By the Rev. Jesse Lee. Baltimore: Magill & Clime. 12mo. pp. 366. 1810.

Life of the Rev. Jesse Lee. By the Rev. Le Roy M. Lee, D.D. Louisville, Ky.: John Early, Printer. 8vo. 1848.

Memorials of the Introduction of Methodism into the Eastern States. By the Rev. Abel Stevens, LL.D. Boston: Charles H. Pierce; pp. 490. 1848.

Second Series of the above, same author and publisher; pp. 492. 1852.

Minutes of the Annual Conferences of the Methodist Episcopal Church in the United States. 1773–1881. Eighteen volumes, 8vo. Methodist Book Concern, 805 Broadway, New York.

Files of the *Zion's Herald*, 1823–1881. 36 Bromfield Street, Boston.

Jesse Lee under the Old Elm. A pamphlet. Boston: by the Rev. John W. Hamilton. 1879.

Cyclopædia of Methodism. By the Right Rev. Bishop Matthew Simpson, D.D., LL.D. Philadelphia: Everts & Stewart. 4to. pp. 1827. 1878.

MSS. "Sketches of Methodism in Boston," by Hon. Jacob Sleeper, of Boston; and "in Chelsea and Dorchester," by the Rev. Edward Otheman, of Chelsea. (Unpublished.)

CHAPTER X.

THE EPISCOPAL CHURCH.

BY THE REV. PHILLIPS BROOKS, D.D.,

Rector of Trinity Church.

THE Rev. Joshua Wingate Weeks was a minister of the Church of England, and a missionary of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts, settled at Marblehead, in Massachusetts. In the year 1778 he wrote to the society an account of "The state of the Episcopal churches in the Province of Massachusetts Bay, New Hampshire, etc." Of the churches in Boston he wrote: "Trinity Church in Boston is still open, the prayers for the King and Royal Family, etc., being omitted. The King's Chapel is made use of as a meeting-house by a Dissenting congregation. The French have received leave from the Congress to make use of Christ Church for the purposes of their worship; but the proprietors of it, having notice of this, persuaded Mr. Parker to preach in it every Sunday in the afternoon, by which means it remains untouched. . . . In a word," he adds, "our ecclesiastical affairs wear a very gloomy aspect at present in that part of the world."

What Mr. Weeks thus wrote in 1778 was mainly true two years later, in 1780, at the point where I begin to sketch the history of the Episcopal Church in Boston for the last hundred years. In the mean time, the Rev. Stephen C. Lewis, who had been chaplain of a regiment of light dragoons in the army of General Burgoyne, had become the regular minister of Christ Church; but the congregation of the Old South were still worshipping in the King's Chapel, and the Rev. Dr. Samuel Parker was in charge of Trinity. These were the three Episcopal parishes in Boston in the year 1780. The King's Chapel with its house of worship on Tremont Street, Christ Church in Salem Street, and Trinity Church in Summer Street. The King's Chapel had been in existence since 1689, Christ Church since 1723, and Trinity Church since 1734.

It is not difficult to see what it was that made "our ecclesiastical affairs" wear such a "gloomy aspect in this part of the world" in the days which immediately followed the Revolution. To the old Puritan dislike of Episcopacy had been added the distrust of the English Church as the church of the oppressors of the colonies. Up to the beginning of the Revolution the

Episcopal Church in Boston had been counted an intruder. It had never been the church of the people, but had largely lived upon the patronage and favor of the English governors. The outbreak of the Revolution had found the Rev. Dr. Henry Caner, rector of King's Chapel, and the Rev. Dr. William Walter, rector of Trinity. Both of these clergymen went to Halifax with the British troops when Boston was evacuated in 1776.[1] In one of the record books of King's Chapel, Dr. Caner made the following entry: —

"An unnatural rebellion of the colonies against His Majesty's government obliged the loyal part of his subjects to evacuate their dwellings and substance, and take refuge in Halifax, London, and elsewhere; by which means the public worship at King's Chapel became suspended, and is likely to remain so until it shall please God, in the course of his providence, to change the hearts of the rebels, or give success to His Majesty's arms for suppressing the rebellion. Two boxes of church plate, and a silver christening basin were left in the hands of the Rev. Dr. Breynton at Halifax, to be delivered to me or my order, agreeable to his note receipt in my hands."

At Christ Church the Rev. Dr. Mather Byles, Jr., resigned the rectorship on Easter Tuesday, 1775, meaning to go to Portsmouth in New Hampshire; but political tumults making that impossible, he remained in Boston and performed the duty of chaplain to some of the regiments until after the evacuation.[1] At Trinity alone was there any real attempt to meet the new condition of things by changes in the church's worship. The parts of the liturgy, having reference to the King and the Royal Family [1] were omitted, and this was the only sign which the Episcopal Church in Boston made of any willingness to accommodate herself to the patriotic feeling of the times; and even with her mutilated liturgy, the associations of her worship with the hated power of England still remained. No doubt the few people who gathered in Trinity Church during the Revolution were those whose sympathy with the cause of the struggling colonies was weakest and most doubtful. As one looks at her position when the war is closed, he sees clearly that before the Episcopal Church can become a powerful element in American life she has before her, first, a struggle for existence; and then another struggle, hardly less difficult, to separate herself from English influences and standards, and to throw herself heartily into the interests and hopes of the new nation.

Of how those two struggles began in the country at large, when the Revolutionary war was over and our independence was established, there is not room here to speak except very briefly. It was the sprouting of a tree which had been cut down to the very roots. The earliest sign of life was a meeting at New Brunswick in New Jersey, in 1784, when thirteen clergymen and laymen, from New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania, came together to see what could be made of the fragments of the Church of England which were scattered through the now independent colonies. The same year there was a meeting held in Boston, where seven clergymen of Massachusetts and Rhode Island consulted on the condition and prospects of their

[1] [See Mr. Goddard's chapter in the present volume. — ED.]

church. The next year there was a larger meeting held in Philadelphia, — what may be called the first convention of the Episcopal Church in the United States, — when delegates from seven of the thirteen States were assembled. This was on Sept. 27, 1785. Evidently the fragments of the church had life in them, and a tendency to reach toward each other and seek a corporate existence. From the beginning, too, there evidently was in many parts of the church a certain sense of opportunity, a feeling that now was the time to seek some enlargement of the church's standards, which would not probably occur again. Under this feeling, when the time for the revision of the liturgy arrived, the Athanasian Creed was dropped out of the Prayer Book. The other changes made were mostly such as the new political condition of the country called for. These changes were definitely fixed in the convention which met in Philadelphia in 1789.

But before that time another most important question had been settled. There could be no Episcopal Church in this country without bishops, and as yet there was not a bishop of the Episcopal Church in the country. In the colonial condition various efforts had been made to secure the consecration of bishops for America, but political fears and prejudices had always prevented their success; but no sooner was independence thoroughly established, than a more determined effort was begun. In 1783 the Rev. Dr. Samuel Seabury was sent abroad by some of the clergymen of Connecticut, to endeavor to secure consecration to the episcopate to which they had elected him. After fruitless attempts to induce the authorities of the Church of England to give him what he sought, he finally had recourse to the nonjuring Church in Scotland, and was consecrated at Aberdeen on Nov. 14, 1784. He returned at once to America and began to do a bishop's work. The first ordination of an Episcopal minister in Boston, which must have been an occasion of some interest in the Puritan city, was on March 27, 1789, when the Rev. John C. Ogden was ordained in Trinity Church by Bishop Seabury.

Meanwhile, further south, a similar attempt was being made to secure Episcopal consecration from the Church of England, and with better success. On Feb. 4, 1787, the Rev. Dr. William White, of Philadelphia, and the Rev. Dr. Samuel Provoost, of New York, were consecrated bishops in the chapel of Lambeth Palace. Thus the Episcopal Church in the United States found itself fully organized for its work. On May 7, 1797, the Rev. Dr. Edward Bass, of Newburyport, was consecrated in Christ Church, Philadelphia, to be Bishop of the Diocese of Massachusetts; and the churches of Boston became of course subjects of his Episcopal care.

It must have been a striking, as it was certainly a novel scene, when Bishop Bass, on his return to Boston after his consecration, was welcomed by the Massachusetts Convention which was then in session. He was conducted in his robes from the vestry of Trinity Church to the chancel, where he was addressed in behalf of the members of the convention by the Rev. Dr. Walter, now returned from his exile in Nova Scotia, and made rector of

Christ Church. The bishop responded "in terms of great modesty, propriety, and affection." Sometime after, the Episcopal churches in Rhode Island, and subsequently those in New Hampshire, placed themselves under his jurisdiction.

It had not been without reluctance, and a jealous unwillingness to surrender their independence, that the churches in Massachusetts had joined their brethren in the other States to accomplish the reorganization of their church; but in the end two of the Boston churches became identified with the new body. To Dr. Parker indeed, of Trinity Church, a considerable degree of influence is to be ascribed in harmonizing difficulties, and making possible a union between the two efforts after organized life which had begun in Connecticut and Pennsylvania. Before, however, the general Constitution of the Episcopal Church was agreed upon in Philadelphia in 1789, the oldest of the three parishes in Boston had changed its faith and its associations, and begun its own separate and peculiar life. It was before the Revolutionary war was ended, and while their house of worship was still used by the congregation of the Old South, in September, 1782, that the wardens of King's Chapel — Dr. Thomas Bulfinch and Mr. James Ivers — invited Mr. James Freeman, a young man of twenty-three years of age, then living at Walpole, to officiate for them as reader for six months. He was a native of Charlestown, had received his early education at the Boston Latin School, and had graduated at Harvard College in 1777. At the Easter meeting, April 21, 1783, he was chosen pastor of the chapel. The invitation, in reply to which he accepted the pastorate, said to him: "The proprietors consent to such alterations in the service as are made by the Rev. Dr. Parker; and leave the use of the Athanasian Creed at your discretion."

The new pastor and his people soon grew warmly attached to one another; and when, in the course of the next two years, Mr. Freeman told his parishioners that his opinions had undergone such a change that he found some parts of the liturgy inconsistent with the faith which he had come to hold, and offered them an amended form of prayer for use at the chapel, the proprietors voted, Feb. 20, 1785, that it was necessary to make some alterations in some parts of the liturgy, and appointed a committee to report such alterations. On March 28 the committee were ready with their report; and on June 19 the proprietors decided by a vote of twenty to seven "that the Common Prayer, as it now stands amended, be adopted by this church, as the form of prayer to be used in future by this church and congregation." The alterations in the liturgy were for the most part such as involved the omission of the doctrine of the Trinity. They were principally those of the celebrated English divine, Dr. Samuel Clarke. The amended Prayer Book was used in the chapel until 1811, when it was again revised, and still other changes made.

Thus the oldest of the Episcopal churches had become the first of the Unitarian churches of America; and now the question was how she still

stood toward the sister churches with whom she had heretofore been in communion. Her people still counted themselves Episcopalians. They wanted to be part of the new Episcopal Church of the United States. Many of them were more or less uneasy at the lack of ordination for their minister. In 1786 Mr. Freeman applied to Bishop Seabury to be ordained; but Bishop Seabury, after asking the advice of his clergy, did not think fit to confer orders upon him on such a profession of faith as he thought proper to give, which was no more than that he believed the Scriptures. Mr. Freeman then went to see Dr. Provoost at New York. The doctor, who was not yet a bishop, gave Mr. Freeman some reason to hope that he would comply with

TREMONT STREET LOOKING NORTH.[1]

his wishes; but in the next year, when the wardens of the chapel sent a letter to Dr. Provoost, who in the meantime had received consecration, "to inquire whether ordination for the Rev. Mr. Freeman can be obtained on terms agreeable to him and to the proprietors of this church," the bishop answered that after consulting with his council of advice, he and they thought that a matter of such importance ought to be reserved for the consideration of the General Convention.

[1] [This view of Tremont Street, looking toward King's Chapel, follows a water-color presented to the Public Library in 1875. A letter from Mr. B. P. Shillaber, dated March 17, 1875, on the files of the Trustees of the Library, says it was painted by a daughter of General Knox, and belonged to the late Miss Catharine Putnam; and was painted certainly before 1806, and perhaps about 1800. The arch in the Common fence is where the present West-street gate is.

A view from the other end of the vista, showing King's Chapel, as looked at from the north, and taken about 1830, is given in Greenwood's *History of King's Chapel*, 1833. — Ed.]

This ended the effort for Episcopal ordination, and on Nov. 18, 1787, after the usual Sunday evening service, the senior warden of the King's Chapel, Dr. Thomas Bulfinch, acting for the congregation, ordained Mr. Freeman to be "rector, minister, priest, pastor, teaching elder, and public teacher" of their society. Of course so bold and so unusual an act excited violent remonstrance. A protest was sent forth by certain of the original proprietors of the chapel, to which the wardens issued a reply. Another protest came from Dr. Bass of Newburyport, Dr. Parker of Trinity Church, Mr. Montague of Christ Church, and Mr. Ogden of Portsmouth in New Hampshire; but from the day of Mr. Freeman's ordination the King's Chapel ceased to be counted among the Episcopal churches of Boston.[1] There still remained some questions to be settled with regard to the bequest of Mr. William Price, the founder of the Price lectureship, of which the King's Chapel had been the original administrator. These questions lingered until 1824, when they were finally disposed of by the arrangement between the King's Chapel and Trinity Church, under which these lectures are still provided by the latter.

It was a severe blow to the church, which was with such difficulty struggling back to life, that one of the strongest of her very few parishes should thus reject her creed and abandon her fellowship. The whole transaction bears evidence of the confusion of the ecclesiastical life of those distracted days. The spirit of Unitarianism was already present in many of the Congregational churches of New England. It was because in the King's Chapel that spirit met the clear terms of a stated and required liturgy that that church was the first to set itself avowedly upon the basis of the new belief. The attachment to the liturgy was satisfied by the retention of so much of its well-known form; and the high character of Mr. Freeman, and the profound respect which his sincerity and piety and learning won in all the town, did a great deal to strengthen the establishment of the belief to which his congregation gave their assent.[2]

Christ Church and Trinity Church alone were left — two vigorous parishes — to keep alive for many years the fire of the Episcopal Church in Boston. In 1792 Dr. Walter returned to Boston and became rector of Christ Church, where he remained until his death in 1800. In the same year (1792) the Rev. John Sylvester John Gardiner became the assistant of Dr. Parker at Trinity Church. Dr. Gardiner's ministry is one of those which give strong character to the life of the Episcopal Church here during the century. Born in Wales, and in large part educated in England, he was

[1] [See Dr. Peabody's chapter in the present volume. — ED.]

[2] Twice since the chapel changed its liturgy and ordained its own minister, the service of the Episcopal Church has been held by Episcopal clergymen within its venerable walls. The first occasion was in 1858, when for two Sundays the Church of the Advent, whose building was being repaired, was kindly given the use of the chapel for its services. The second was in 1873, when, after the great fire in which Trinity Church was destroyed, the annual series of Price Lectures was, by the cordial invitation of the minister and wardens, preached in the chapel by the bishop of the diocese of Massachusetts and various Episcopal clergymen of Boston.

the true Anglican of the eighteenth century. For thirty-seven years he was the best known and most influential of the Episcopal ministers of Boston. His broad and finished scholarship, his strong and positive manhood, his genial hospitality, his fatherly affection, and his eloquence and wit made him through all those years a marked and powerful person, not merely in the church but in the town.[1]



J. S. J. GARDINER, D.D.

After the year 1790 the diocesan conventions of the Episcopal Church in Massachusetts became regular and constant. They were generally held in Boston, — their religious services mostly in Trinity Church, and their business sessions usually in Concert Hall. The business which they had to do was very small, but every year seems to show a slightly increasing strength. In 1795 the Rev. Dr. Parker and Mr. William Tudor were sent as delegates to the General Convention which was to meet in Philadelphia in the following September; so that the church in Massachusetts had now become entirely a part of the general church throughout the land. In

[1] [See a memoir of Dr. Gardiner in Quincy's *History of the Boston Athenæum*. — ED.]

1797 a committee was sent to Samuel Adams, the Governor, to ask him not to appoint the annual Fast Day in such a way that it should fall in Easter week, in order that it may not "wound the feelings of so many of the citizens of this Commonwealth as compose the body of the Protestant Episcopalians." In various ways one traces the slow growth of the church; yet still it was a very little body. In 1800, at the meeting of the convention of the diocese, "in the library in Franklin Place," it was only five clergymen, of whom one was the bishop, and six laymen that made up the assembly.

In 1803 Bishop Bass died, after an administration which was full of good sense and piety, but which had not enough energy or positive character to give the church a strong position or to secure much promise for its future. The only other man who had stood at his post during the Revolution,—the man to whom, as his successor, Dr. Gardiner, said of him in his funeral sermon, "must doubtless be attributed the preservation of the Episcopal Church in this town,"—Dr. Samuel Parker, of Trinity Church, was chosen to be the successor of Bishop Bass; but he died on Dec. 6, 1804, before he had performed any of the duties of his office, and the diocese was once more without a bishop. Indeed, in these early days it was not by any special oversight or inspiration of the bishops that the Episcopal Church was growing strong. It was by the long and faithful pastorships of the ministers of her parishes. Such a pastorship had been that of Dr. Parker. For thirty-one years Trinity Church enjoyed his care. "I well remember him," writes Dr. Lowell, of the West Church, "as a tall, well-proportioned man, with a broad, cheerful, and rubicund face, and flowing hair; of fine powers of conversation, and easy and affable in his manners. He was given to hospitality, and went about doing good." He too was a man of the eighteenth century, not of the nineteenth; but he was thoroughly the man for his own time, and the Episcopal Church in Boston will always be his debtor. In the year after Bishop Parker died, another of the long and useful pastorates of Boston began in the succession of the Rev. Asa Eaton to the rectorship of Christ Church, where he remained until 1829.

It was not until 1811 that it was found practicable to unite the Episcopal Church in Massachusetts with the same church in Rhode Island and New Hampshire, under the care of the Right Rev. Alexander Viets Griswold, who was consecrated bishop of what was called the Eastern Diocese. With Bishop Griswold a new period of the life of the Episcopal Church in Boston may be considered to begin,—a period of growth and enterprise. Up to this time the church had been struggling for life, and gradually separating itself from the English traditions which had haunted its thought and hampered its usefulness. It had been a weak and in some sense a foreign church. Now it had grown to considerable strength. Its ministers were true Americans. It prayed for the Governors and Congress of the Union with entire loyalty. It took, indeed, no active part in the speculations or the controversies of the day. Its ministers were not forward in theological

or political discussion. It rested with entire satisfaction upon its completed standards, and contributed no active help to the settlement of the theological tumults which were raging around it; but it was doing good and growing strong. It had won for itself the respect and confidence of the community; and when the first returns are made from parishes to the diocesan convention in 1812, the two Boston churches report a considerable number of communicants. Christ Church has sixty, and Trinity Church has one hundred and fifty, and on the great festivals as many as three hundred.

The second period, the period of growth and of some enterprise, may be said to extend from 1811 to 1843. The earliest addition to the number of churches, which had remained the same ever since the departure of King's Chapel, was in the foundation of St. Matthew's Church in what was then the little district of South Boston. That picturesque peninsula, which now teems with crowded life, had in 1816 a population of seven or eight hundred. In that year the services of the Episcopal Church were begun by a devoted layman, Mr. John H. Cotting; and two years later a church building was consecrated there by Bishop Griswold. The parish has passed through many vicissitudes and dangers since that day, but it has always retained its life and done good service to the multitudes who have gradually gathered around it.

In 1819 another new parish began to appear, formed principally out of Trinity Church; and on June 3, 1820, the new St. Paul's Church in Tremont Street was consecrated by Bishop Griswold, assisted by Bishop Brownell, of Connecticut. The first rector of the new parish was the Rev. Samuel Farmar Jarvis, a native of Connecticut, an ecclesiastic of sincere devotion to his church, and a scholar of excellent attainments. St. Paul's Church made a notable and permanent addition to the power of episcopacy in the city. Its Grecian temple seemed to the men who built it to be a triumph of architectural beauty and of fitness for the church's services. "The interior of St. Paul's," so it was written while the church was new, "is remarkable for its simplicity and beauty; and the materials of which the building is constructed give it an intrinsic value and an effect which have not been produced by any of the classic models that have been attempted of bricks and plaster in other cities. The erection of this church may be considered the commencement of an era of the art in Boston." On its building committee, among other well-known men, were George Sullivan, Daniel Webster, David Sears, and William Shimmin. When it was finished, it had cost $83,000. The parish leaped at once into strength; and in 1821 it reports that "it has ninety communicants, and that between six and seven hundred persons attend its services."

In 1824, when Boston had reached a population of fifty-eight thousand, the four Episcopal churches which it contained numbered in all six hundred and thirty-four communicants,—certainly not a great number, but certainly an appreciable proportion of the religious community.

In 1827 Dr. Alonzo Potter succeeded Dr. Jarvis at St. Paul's; and he brought with him that broad, strong intellect and noble character and earnest zeal which made him all his life one of the very strongest powers in the Episcopal Church of the United States. In the same year the Rev. George W. Doane, who was afterward the successor of Dr. Gardiner at Trinity, came to be his assistant. These were both notable additions to the church's ministry in Boston. They were men of modern character; they put new life into the now well-established church. The very dryness of the tree when it was brought hither from England had perhaps made it more possible to transplant it safely, but now that its roots were in the ground it was ready for more vigorous life. In quite different ways, with very dissimilar characters and habits of thought, Dr. Potter and Dr. Doane represent not unfitly the two great tendencies toward rational breadth and toward ecclesiastical complexity, which were beginning to take possession not merely of this church but of all the churches. The Rev. John H. Hopkins, who in 1831 became the assistant of Dr. Doane at Trinity, was another of the strong characters who showed the church's greater life.

Another name of great interest in the church history of Boston appeared in 1829, when the Rev. William Croswell came from Hartford, a young deacon just ordained, to succeed Dr. Eaton at Christ Church. Dr. Eaton's ministry had been long and useful. He had established in 1815 the first Sunday-school which ever existed in this region. His parish had no doubt already begun to change with the changes of the city's population; but when Mr. Croswell came there it was still strong, and, though his most remarkable ministry was to be elsewhere than in Christ Church, his coming there marks the first advent to the city of one of the most interesting men who have ever filled its Episcopal pulpits.

The slow addition of parish after parish still went on. In 1830 Grace Church, which had been struggling with much difficulty into life, appears at last as an organized parish, and is admitted into union with the Convention. At first the new congregation worshipped in Piedmont Square, and then in Bedford Street. It was not until 1836 that its new stone church in Temple Street was finished and consecrated. In Roxbury the first movement toward the establishment of an Episcopal Church began to appear as early as 1832; and, after worshipping for a while in a building called the Female High School, the new parish finished and occupied its sober, serious stone structure on St. James Street in 1834. Its first rector was the Rev. M. A. De Wolf Howe, who is now the bishop of the diocese of Central Pennsylvania. While these new parishes were springing into life, the old parish of Trinity was building its new house of worship, which was to stand until the great fire should sweep it away in 1872. The solid, battlemented Gothic church, which for so many years stood and frowned at the corner of Summer and Hawley streets, was consecrated on Nov. 11, 1829. The next year Dr. Gardiner, for so many years the honored minister of the parish, died in

England, where he was seeking his lost health, and Dr. Doane became rector of Trinity Church in his stead.

In these years also another man appears for the first time, who is afterward to hold a peculiar place in the life of the church in Boston; to be, indeed, the representative figure in its charitable work. It is the Rev. E. M. P. Wells, who is in charge of the House of Reformation Chapel at South Boston. Indeed, now for the first time there began to be a movement of

THE RUINS OF TRINITY, 1872.

the Episcopal Church toward the masses of the poor and helpless. Up to this time it had been almost altogether the church of the rich and influential. It had prided itself upon the respectability of its membership; but in 1837 St. Paul's, which had now passed into the earnest and fruitful ministry of the Rev. John S. Stone, had a mission-school of between sixty and eighty scholars on Boston Neck, and there was a Free Church in the Eleventh Ward-Room in Tremont Street, and Mr. Wells had his work at South Boston. The movements were not very strong nor very enduring, but they showed a new spirit, and were the promises of better things to come.

In 1840 there were the beginnings of two new parishes. The church at Jamaica Plain was as yet only a mission of St. James's in Roxbury, and was under the charge of the rector of that church till 1845, when it secured a minister of its own. In Charlestown a few Episcopalians met in the Congregational Church, and organized a parish under the charge of the Rev. Nathaniel T. Bent. The corner-stone of their building was laid in 1841, and the building was finished the next year. Both of these parishes were named St. John's.

Thus in 1843 there were in what is now Boston seven Episcopal parishes. In that year Bishop Griswold died. When he was chosen bishop, in 1811, there were only two parishes; and, besides this increase in the number of organized churches, there had begun to be, as we have seen, some movement of missionary life. These thirty-two years had been a period of growth and quiet enterprise. There had been no marked stir of active thought; men had believed and taught much as their fathers had before them. There had been no disputes or controversies about faith or worship; but all the time a fuller and fuller life was entering into the whole church. The evangelical spirit, which was the controlling power of the Church of England, ruled the parishes here, and inspired the system which under the churchmanship of the eighteenth century had been so dead. Of all this time the type and representative is Bishop Griswold. He stands, indeed, at the head of the active history of the church in Massachusetts to give it, as it were, its true key-note, — somewhat as Bishop White stands at the start of the Episcopal Church in the United States at large; or, we may say, perhaps, as Washington stands at the beginning of the history of the nation. He had the quiet energy which the times needed, a deep and simple piety, a spirit of conciliation which was yet full of sturdy conscientiousness, a free but reverent treatment of church methods, a quiet humor, and abundance of "moderation, good sense, and careful equipoise." He had much of the repose and peace of the old Anglicanism, and yet was a true American. He had patience and hope and courage, sweetness and reasonableness in that happy conjunction which will make his memory, as the years go by, to be treasured as something sacred and saintly by the growing church.

The third period in the history of the Episcopal Church in Boston, reaching from 1843 to about 1861, is not so peaceful as the last. Before Bishop Griswold died the signs of coming disagreement had appeared; and even before it was felt in this country, a new and aggressive school of church life had taken definite shape in England. This is not the place to write the history of that great movement which within less than fifty years has so changed the life of the English Church. In 1833 the first of the so-named *Tracts for the Times* was issued at Oxford, and from then until 1841 the constant succession of treatises, devoted to the development of what became known as Tractarian or Puseyite ideas, kept alive a per-

petual tumult in the Church of England. Led by such men as Dr. Pusey and John Henry Newman, the school attracted many of the ablest and most devoted of young Englishmen. The points which its theology magnified were the apostolical succession of the ministry, baptismal regeneration, the eucharistic sacrifice, and church tradition as a rule of faith. Connected with its doctrinal beliefs, there came an increased attention to church ceremonies and an effort to surround the celebration of divine worship with mystery and splendor.

This great movement, — this Catholic Revival, as its earnest disciples love to call it, — was most natural. It was the protest and self-assertion of a partly neglected side of religious life; it was a reaction against some of the dominant forms of religious thought which had become narrow and exclusive; it was the effort of the church to complete the whole sphere of her life; it was the expression of certain perpetual and ineradicable tendencies of the human soul. No wonder, therefore, that it was powerful. It made most enthusiastic devotees; it organized new forms of life; it created a new literature; it found its way into the halls of legislation; it changed the aspect of whole regions of education. No wonder, also, that in a place so free-minded and devout as Boston each one of the permanent tendencies of religious thought and expression should sooner or later seek for admission. Partly in echo, therefore, of what was going on in England, and partly as the simultaneous result of the same causes which had produced the movement there, it was not many years before the same school arose in the Episcopal Church in America; and it showed itself first in Boston in the organization of the Church of the Advent. The first services of this new parish were held in an upper room at No. 13 Merrimac Street, on Dec. 1, 1844. Shortly after, the congregation moved to a hall at the corner of Lowell and Causeway streets, and on Nov. 28, 1847, it took possession of a church in Green Street, where it remained until 1864. Its rector was Dr. William Croswell, a man of most attractive character and beautiful purity of life. We have seen him already as minister of Christ Church from 1829 to 1840. After his resignation of that parish he became rector of St. Peter's Church, Auburn, New York, whence he returned to Boston to undertake the new work of the Church of the Advent. The feature made most prominent by its founders with regard to the new parish was that the church was free. This, combined with its more frequent services, its daily public recitation of morning and evening prayer, an increased attention to the details of worship, the lights on its stone altar, and its use of altar-cloths, were the visible signs which distinguished it from the other parishes in town.

By this time the poor and friendless population of Boston had grown very large, and the minister and laity of the Church of the Advent, in common with those of the other parishes in the city, devoted much time and attention to their visitation and relief.

Bishop Griswold before his death had feared the influence of the new

school of churchmanship, and had written a tract with the view of meeting what he thought to be its dangers; but the duty of dealing with the new state of things in Boston fell mostly to the lot of his successor. In the year 1842 the Rev. Dr. Manton Eastburn, rector of the Church of the Ascension in New York, had become rector of Trinity Church in Boston, and had been consecrated assistant-bishop of Massachusetts. That interesting ceremony took place in Trinity Church on Dec. 29, 1842. On Bishop Griswold's death, in 1843, Bishop Eastburn succeeded him; and in his Convention address of 1844 we find him already lifting up his voice against "certain views which, having made their appearance at various periods since the Reformation, and passed away, have been again brought forward in our time." These remonstrances are repeated almost yearly for the rest of the bishop's life. On Dec. 2, 1845, Bishop Eastburn issued a pastoral letter to the clergy of his diocese, in which he recounts his disapprobation of "various offensive innovations upon the ancient usage of our church," which he had witnessed on the occasion of a recent episcopal visit to the Church of the Advent. On Nov. 24, 1846, he writes to Dr. Croswell that he cannot visit the parish officially again until the offensive arrangements of the church are altered. These utterances of the bishop led to a long discussion and correspondence which lasted for the next ten years. On Nov. 9, 1851, Dr. Croswell died very suddenly, and Bishop Eastburn's discussion was continued with his successor, the Right Rev. Horatio Southgate. It was not until Dec. 14, 1856, that the parish received again the visitation of its bishop; and in his report to the diocesan convention in 1857 Bishop Eastburn explains the change in his action by saying that "the General Convention having passed, during its session in October last, a new canon on episcopal visitations, I appointed the above mentioned day, shortly after the close of its sittings, for a visit to the Church of the Advent, for the purpose of administering confirmation."

This closed the open conflict between the bishop and the parish. In 1864 the Church of the Advent moved from Green Street to its present building in Bowdoin Street, where it was served, after Bishop Southgate's departure in 1858, by the Rev. Dr. Bolles. Upon his resignation in 1870 the parish passed into the ministry of members of an English society of mission priests, known as the Brotherhood of St. John the Evangelist, and in 1872 the Rev. Charles C. Grafton, a member of that society, became its rector. In 1868 it began the erection of a new church in Brimmer Street, which is not yet completed. The peculiarities of faith and worship of this parish have always made it a prominent and interesting object in the church life of Boston.

But during these years of conflict the healthy life and growth of the church were going on. In 1842 began the long and powerful rectorship of the Rev. Dr. Alexander H. Vinton at St. Paul's Church. For seventeen years his ministry there gave noble dignity to the life of the church in Boston, and was the source of vast good to many souls. His work may be con-

sidered as having done more than that of any other man who ever preached in Boston, to bring the Episcopal Church into the understanding, the sympathy, and the respect of the people. His vigorous mind and great acquirements and commanding character and earnest eloquence made him a most influential power in the city and the church. He was met as he first came to St. Paul's by a deep religious interest which was only the promise of the profound spiritual life which will always make the years of his ministry here memorable and sacred. He remained in Boston until 1858, when he removed to Philadelphia; but later in life, in 1869, he returned to his old home, and was rector of Emmanuel Church till December, 1877. As these pages are being written he has just passed away, leaving a memory which will be a perpetual treasure to the church. He died in Philadelphia on April 26, 1881.

In 1843 the growth of the city southward toward the Neck was marked by the organization of the new Church of the Messiah in Florence Street, which, under the ministry of the Rev. George M. Randall, sprang at once to useful life. The parish worshipped for a while in a hall at the corner of Washington and Common streets. The corner-stone of the new Church was laid Nov. 10, 1847, and the church was consecrated Aug. 29, 1848. In 1843 the mission work of the Rev. E. M. P. Wells, which afterward became so well known, and which was never wholly abandoned till his death, began at what was called Trinity Hall in Summer Street. About the same time the Rev. J. P. Robinson began a mission for sailors in Ann Street, which for many years excited the interest and elicited the generosity of the Episcopalians of Boston, and which still survives in what is called the Free Church of St. Mary, for sailors, in Richmond Street. In 1846 an individual act of Christian generosity provided the building of St. Stephen's Chapel in Purchase Street, the gift of Mr. William Appleton, where Dr. Wells labored in loving and humble sympathy and companionship with the poor until, on the terrible night of Nov. 9, 1872, the great fire swept his church and house away. He was a remarkable man, with a genius for charity, and a childlike love for God.

Meanwhile a parish was slowly growing into life in the populous district of East Boston. St. John's Church was organized there in 1845. After many disappointments and disasters it finished and occupied its house of worship in 1852. In 1849 St. Mary's Church in Dorchester was added to the number of suburban churches. In 1851 St. Mark's Church at the South End finds its first mention in the record of the acceptance of its rectorship by the Rev. P. H. Greenleaf, who had just resigned the charge of St. John's Church in Charlestown. The next year this new church bought for itself a church building which it afterward removed to Newton Street, and in which it is still worshipping. In 1856 the Rev. Dr. Thomas R. Lambert began his ministry in Charlestown, and the Rev. William R. Babcock came to Jamaica Plain. In 1860 the Rev. Dr. William R. Nicholson became rector of St. Paul's Church, and the Rev. George S. Converse of St. James's.

These were years full of life, a life which, if it sometimes became restless and controversial, flowed for the most part in a steady stream of zealous and ever-widening work. The traditions which had bound the church almost exclusively to the rich and cultivated were cast aside. It had accepted its mission to all classes and conditions of men. The number of communicants increased. In 1847 there were about two thousand in the churches of what then was Boston, and men whom the city knew and felt and honored were preaching in the Episcopal pulpits.

With the year 1860 begins the latest period of our history. A new Boston was growing up on the Back Bay; the country was just entering on the great struggle with rebellion and slavery; and the fixed lines of theological thought were being largely broken through. All of these changes were felt in the fortunes of the Episcopal Church in Boston. On March 17, 1860, a meeting of those who were desirous of forming a new Episcopal church, west of the Public Garden, was held at the residence of Mr. William R. Lawrence, 98 Beacon Street. The result of this meeting, and the others to which it led, was the organization of Emmanuel Church, and the erection of its house of worship in Newbury Street, which was consecrated April 24, 1862. The parish held its services, before its church building was finished, in the Mechanics' Hall, at the corner of Bedford and Chauncy streets. Of this parish the first rector was the Rev. Dr. Frederick D. Huntington, who had long been honorably known in Boston, first as the minister of the South Congregational Church, in the Unitarian denomination, and afterward as the Plummer Professor of Christian Morals and Preacher to the University at Cambridge. It was in view of his leaving his Unitarian associations, and seeking orders in the Episcopal Church, and in expectation of his becoming its rector, that the parish of Emmanuel Church was organized. Dr. Huntington was ordained Deacon in Trinity Church, on Wednesday Sept. 12, 1860, Bishop Burgess, of Maine, preaching the sermon. On the next Sunday he took charge of his new congregation, and his ministry from that time until he was made Bishop of the diocese of Central New York, in 1869, was one of the most powerful influences which the Episcopal Church has ever exercised in Boston. Under his care Emmanuel Church became at once a strong parish, and soon put forth its strength in missionary work. It founded in 1863 a mission chapel in the ninth ward, from which came by and by the Chapel of the Good Shepherd, which now, with its pleasant building in Cortes Street, is an independent and useful parish church.

In 1860 St. Matthew's Church in South Boston, which had for twenty-two years enjoyed the wise and gracious ministry of the Rev. Dr. Joseph H. Clinch, was left without a rector by his resignation; and in 1861 the Rev. Dr. J. I. T. Coolidge was chosen to supply his place. Dr. Coolidge, like Dr. Huntington, had been a Unitarian minister, and had only a short time before received ordination in the Episcopal Church.

In 1861 the war broke out, and for the next four years the country was in the struggle with Rebellion. It is good to find that from the Bishop's chair there came no hesitating utterances of loyalty. In his Convention address in 1861 Bishop Eastburn denounces the "nefarious rebellion." In 1862 he congratulates the Convention on the "success with which thus far a gracious Providence has crowned the armies of the Union in their conflict with the perpetrators of rebellion." In 1863 he rejoices over the loyal utterances of the late General Convention, and particularly over the pastoral letter of the bishops: "A masterly document it is, representing this stupendous insurrection as a criminal violation of God's law, and strengthening its positions by reference not only to the Bible, but to the pungent old homily of our church against rebellion." In 1864 his Convention address bespeaks sympathy for "the wounded thousands among our soldiers and among the legions of our misguided enemies;" and at last, in 1865, he rejoices over the sight of "a most wicked rebellion at last defeated, its military power broken, and the dawn appearing of what we trust will ere long be a bright day of Union restored, of the renewal of the arts of peace, and of the blotting out of human bondage from every portion of the national territory." Such words are full of the positiveness which belonged to Bishop Eastburn's character, and which made him for so many years a powerful element in the diocese over which he presided and in the city where he lived. He held to his convictions with most unquestioning faithfulness, and strove with all his might to impress them on his congregation and on the church. His long ministry at Trinity Church will always be remembered; and when he resigned his rectorship in 1868 he carried with him the love of many and the respect of all. He was assisted at Trinity Church by several men who have been among the most eminent clergymen of the Episcopal Church. The Rev. John L. Watson, the Rev. Dr. Thomas M. Clark, now Bishop of the Diocese of Rhode Island, the Rev. Dr. John Cotton Smith, the Rev. Dr. Alexander G. Mercer, and the Rev. Dr. Henry C. Potter were successively associated with Bishop Eastburn as assistant ministers on the Greene foundation. After the bishop's resignation of the rectorship of Trinity Church, the Rev. Phillips Brooks became its minister in 1869.

Various missionary enterprises and efforts for the extension of the church occurred during the war, and in the years immediately following its close. In 1861 St. James's Church, Roxbury, established a mission chapel on Tremont Street, which, under the charge of the Rev. Mr. Converse, became a few years later an independent parish, named St. John's. In 1877 St. James's Church, now under the ministry of the Rev. Percy Browne, again manifested its energetic life by the establishment of another mission chapel, in Cottage Street in Dorchester, which is called St. Anne's Chapel. In 1867 St. Mary's Church in Dorchester began a mission in Milton Lower Mills, which has grown into a distinct parish, bearing the name of All Saints'. In 1875, after Dr. Vinton had succeeded Dr. Huntington as rec-

tor of Emmanuel Church, his assistant, the Rev. B. B. Killikelly founded a mission at the West End of Boston, which, bearing the name of the Free Chapel of the Evangelists, is now under the care of Trinity Church. In 1875 a mission at City Point was organized by the Rev. John Wright, rector of St. Matthew's Church. In 1873 a new mission grew up in the part of South Boston called Washington Village, which is known as Grace Chapel, under the charge of the Board of City Missions.

All these are signs of life and energy. Only once has a parish ceased to be. In 1862 the Rev. Dr. Charles Mason, rector of Grace Church, died. He has left a record of the greatest purity of life and faithfulness in work. After his death the parish of Grace Church became so feeble that at last its life departed. Its final report is made in 1865, when it records that the building in Temple Street had been sold to the Methodist Episcopal Society of North Russell Street. Grace Church had been in existence almost forty years.

These last years also have seen great changes in the personal leadership of the parishes and of the church. Bishop Eastburn died Sept. 12, 1872, after an episcopate of thirty years; and his successor, the Rev. Dr. Benjamin Henry Paddock, was consecrated in Grace Church, Brooklyn, N. Y., on Sept. 17, 1873. After Dr. Randall was made bishop of Colorado in 1865, the Rev. Pelham Williams became rector of the Church of the Messiah, and he was succeeded in 1877 by the Rev. Henry F. Allen. In 1877 Dr. Vinton gave up the rectorship of Emmanuel Church, and in 1878 the Rev. Leighton Parks became his successor. The Rev. Henry Burroughs became the rector of the venerable Christ Church in 1868, and the Rev. William Wilberforce Newton succeeded the Rev. Treadwell Walden as rector of St. Paul's Church in 1877.

Very gradually, and by imperceptible degrees, the parishes of Boston have changed their character during this hundred years which we have been surveying. Their churches have ceased to be mere places of worship for the little groups which had combined to build them, preserving carefully the chartered privileges of their parishioners. They have aspired to become religious homes for the community, and centres of religious work for the help of all kinds of suffering and need. Many of the churches are free, opening their pews without discrimination to all who choose to come. Those which are not technically free are eager to welcome the people. In places which the influence of the parish churches cannot reach, local chapels have been freely built. It would be interesting to trace the causes which have both drawn and driven the churches of all denominations to this effort after larger fellowship with the people. In the case of the Episcopal Church it is specially significant, as indicating that she is no longer a stranger in the land.

Besides the parish life of the Episcopal Church in Boston, and the institutions which have grown up under distinctively parochial control, the general educational and charitable institutions of the church should not be left

unmentioned. For many years the project of establishing a Divinity School of the Protestant Episcopal Church at Boston, or somewhere in its immediate neighborhood, had been from time to time recurring. Once or twice small beginnings had been made, but they had never come to any permanent result. In 1867 a very generous gift of Mr. Benjamin Tyler Reed secured what had so long been wanted; and the Episcopal Divinity School of Cambridge was founded on a strong basis which insures its perpetuity. Since that time other liberal gifts have increased its equipment, and it is now one of the best provided theological schools in the country. Though not properly a part of Harvard University, it shares many of its privileges and draws many advantages from its neighborhood.

The Church Home for Orphans and Destitute Children, which is now situated at South Boston, was founded in 1855, by the Rev. Charles Mason, who was then rector of Grace Church. St. Luke's Home for Convalescents, which has its house in the Highlands, was established originally as a parish charity of the Church of the Messiah, during the ministry of the Rev. Dr. Pelham Williams, but it is now an institution of the church at large, and its affairs are administered by a board, of which the bishop is the head.

The great fire of Nov. 9 and 10, 1872, destroyed two of the Episcopal churches of Boston, — Trinity Church in Summer Street, and St. Stephen's Chapel in Purchase Street. St. Stephen's has not yet been rebuilt. Trinity had already begun the preparations for a new church before the fire; and the new buildings[1] on Huntington Avenue were consecrated on Friday, Feb. 9, 1877, by Bishop Paddock, the consecration sermon being preached by the Rev. Dr. Vinton, then rector of Emmanuel Church. Between the time of the fire and the consecration of the new church the services of Trinity Church were held in the Hall of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, in Boylston Street.

These are the principal events which have marked the history of the Episcopal Church in Boston during this last period of the century. There are within the present city limits twenty-two churches and chapels, with five thousand six hundred and seventy-five communicants, and four thousand two hundred and forty-nine scholars in their Sunday-schools.

And these last twenty years have been full of life and movement in theological thought. The Tractarian revival of 1845 has passed into its more distinctively ritualistic stage; and the broader theology, which also had its masters in England, in such men as Dr. Arnold and the Rev. Frederick D. Maurice, has likewise had its clear and powerful effect upon the Episcopal Church in Boston. A lofty belief in man's spiritual possibilities, a large hope for man's eternal destinies, a desire for the careful and critical study of the Bible, and an earnest insistence upon the com-

[1] [A view of the new Trinity is given in the chapter on "Architecture in Boston," in Vol. IV. — Ed.].

prehensive character of the Church of Christ, — these are the characteristics of much of the most zealous pulpit teaching and parish life of these later days.

The Episcopalian of a century ago, whatever might be his surprise at the outward progress which his church has made in Boston, would be still more surprised, if he should come among us now, at the variety in ways of worship, the freedom in the search for truth, and the earnestness of the desire to reach all men and help them, which are the hope and promise for the future of the Episcopal Church in Boston.

Phillips Brooks

CHAPTER XI.

THE UNITARIANS IN BOSTON.

BY THE REV. ANDREW P. PEABODY, D.D., LL.D.,
Plummer Professor of Christian Morals in Harvard University.

THE earliest intimation of dissent in Boston from the normal Calvinistic creed of the Congregational churches is in connection with the settlement of Rev. Jonathan Mayhew, as pastor of the West Church, in 1747. He was regarded as heretical at that time; in the council that ordained him there was no Boston minister, and he never became a member of the Boston Association of Ministers. As a man of genius, energy, and influence, he had hardly his equal among the clergy. He was among the pioneers of the American Revolution, and numbered among his most intimate friends those of his fellow-townsmen who afterward bore the most active part in the conflict with Great Britain. The son of a missionary to the Indians, he distinguished himself by a controversy on the disposal of the funds of the English Society for Propagating the Gospel, which he contended had been bestowed for the evangelization of the Indians and the exigencies of poor colonists, and, as he maintained, wrongfully perverted to the support of Episcopal churches in old and established communities. Among the antagonists thus brought into the field was no less a personage than Secker, Archbishop of Canterbury. Dr. Mayhew made open profession of his departure from the received standard of Orthodoxy both in the pulpit and from the press, and of course must have had a congregation largely, if not fully, in sympathy with his avowed religious belief. He died in 1766.[1]

As we have few landmarks of religious history in the ensuing season of political and military agitation, and as he was the only Boston Unitarian minister who did not survive the War of Independence, we will assume A.D. 1780 as the starting point for our historical outline, and will thus attempt to give record to the fortunes of Unitarianism for a century.

In 1780 nearly all the Congregational pulpits in and around Boston were filled by Unitarians.[2] This condition of things may be accounted for on

[1] [See Dr. McKenzie's chapter in Vol. II., where will be found a likeness of Mayhew.—ED.]

[2] They were commonly called Arminians at the above-named date. The distinctive name of Unitarian did not come into general use till early in the present century, though the specific dogma designated by that name had long been openly preached and professed.

several grounds. The Whitefieldian movement,[1] with its extravagance, fanaticism, and intolerance, had been followed by a strong reaction, especially among persons of education and refinement. Equally had the more passive, yet more rigid, type of Orthodoxy encountered a growing repugnancy wherever it was not received with implicit and unquestioning faith. Nor had the Revolutionary War and the new political interests and relations been void of influence on religious belief and profession. The same spirit that had spurned civil rule from abroad was not slow to detect or suspect the coercive element in creeds and confessions of faith. A more liberal political *régime*, if not logically, yet not unnaturally, postulated a broader theological platform. Then, too, among the English Unitarians were some of the most prominent and active friends of the colonies during their conflict with the mother country. Meanwhile, in the disturbed condition of secular affairs, those who would else have been the guardians of reputed Orthodoxy had relaxed their vigilance. The clergy of the Revolution, to whom the country owes eternal gratitude, did not, as has sometimes been alleged, preach politics instead of religion; but in their strenuous endeavor to hallow patriotism by sermon, prayer, psalm, and hymn, those of them who held the traditional faith of their fathers laid less emphatic stress upon it, and were more tolerant of departure from it, than they would have been at an earlier or a later period.

Under these conditions and influences had grown up a generation of clergy and of laymen, who had not so much drifted from the old moorings as forsaken them from deliberate conviction, and on what seemed to them sufficient reason. I can find no proof that concealment — sometimes charged upon the clergy of that day — was practised by them. The question as to their theological belief can be answered in every instance by extracts from their printed sermons, and by direct testimony as to their undoubted utterances. The true state of the case is that their opinions were not generally regarded as heretical. They professed to agree with Samuel Clarke and his numerous sympathizers in the English Church, and were not without some apparent countenance in the writings of such Dissenters as Watts and Doddridge. Indeed, they seem to have regarded themselves, in what was termed their "high Arianism," as differing in hardly more than an infinitesimal degree from their Trinitarian brethren, forgetting that between the Infinite Being and the greatest of the finite — which they deemed Christ to be — the distance is immeasurable. When there ensued a revival of the earlier theology, in the new-born zeal and fervor it seemed impossible that such lax doctrinal views could ever have been tolerated alongside of the Trinitarian faith, and hence the theory that they must have been held in secret. Yet if in secret, how could the fact be well known and thoroughly substantiated at the present day?

The liberal clergy of that period seem to have had little zeal, and the spirit of propagandism, whether as to their own belief or as to the common

[1] [See Vol. II., ch. vi. — Ed.]

Christianity, was wholly wanting. But they were devout men, of pure and exemplary lives, and diligent in their parochial and social duties. Christian ethics formed the chief staple of their preaching, but not without the constant and loving recognition of Jesus Christ as an infallible Teacher and an all-sufficient Saviour. It may be doubted whether there existed at that time any reasonable ground on which a sharp dividing line could have been drawn through the clergy of Boston and its vicinity. There were few, if any, whose Orthodoxy would half a century later have been recognized as sound, while the liberal clergy were much more nearly in sympathy with moderate Calvinists than with Unitarians of the Priestley school.

As regards the religious condition of these churches it would be equally difficult and unfair to apply the tests of our time. There was very little of religious activity within the several parishes. There were few or no meetings for social devotion or mutual instruction among the laity, nor was there any arrangement or accommodation for other than the public services. "Night meetings," as they were called, were held in general disesteem as of doubtful moral tendency; and it is not many years since the death of a clergyman of eminent piety, and not given to boasting, who to the very last deemed it a title to commendation that he had never in his life been at a "night meeting." The Sunday-school had not begun to be, and the only approach to it was an annual or semi-annual "catechising," — an occasion on which, the children of the parish being gathered in front of the pulpit, the minister asked questions from the catechism in use which were answered by the boldest or brightest of the flock, and closed the service by a short address and a prayer. Thus, to the two Sunday services there was very little of week-day supplement. But both those services were attended with unfailing regularity by all of every age who had not good reason for absence; and the oldest Boston clergyman now living, who was pastor of a congregation second to none in wealth and fashion, says that during the greater part of his ministry occasional sermons, and those which were regarded as of superior interest, were uniformly preached in the afternoon, as the number of persons necessarily absent was smaller than in the morning. There were also preparatory-lectures (so-called), — religious services with sermons, — on some afternoon of the week preceding the celebration of the Lord's Supper. These were well attended, but for the most part by women. The Thursday (morning) lecture, at the First Church, still retained some vestiges of its old importance,[1] as may be seen in the fact that among the printed sermons of the time, on subjects which most commanded the public attention, a great number were first delivered at that lecture.

The number of communicants in those churches was not small, though it included but few young persons. The rite of infant baptism was generally observed, parents who were not communicants claiming this privilege for their children in some of the churches under what was called, by an unintended yet virtual irony, the "half-way covenant,"[2] while in others no

[1] [See Vol. I. p. 515, and II. p. 190. — Ed.] [2] [See Vol. I. p. 104. — Ed.]

profession or obligation of this kind was required. The form of admission to the full communion of the church was assent to a (so-called) covenant, embracing an avowal of Christian belief and a promise to live in accordance with such belief. The several forms of covenant — identical in their import — were most of them preserved intact from the foundation of the respective churches, and contained no specification of dogmas; because, when they were first used, there was no suspicion or anticipation of dissent from traditional Orthodoxy.

As to the more private manifestation of religious faith and feeling, there was a much more distinct recognition of things sacred than now exists in general society. Daily family worship was a prevalent custom. There were few families in which there was not for the younger members a stated time on Sunday afternoon or evening for religious reading, recitation, or instruction. Sunday was observed, not indeed with Puritanical severity, but by refraining from secular labor and business, from needless travelling, and from public and social recreations; while there were not a few who themselves practised Sunday austerities and abstinences which they did not seek to impose upon others. At the same time, the moral standard among the members of these Boston congregations was at least as high as it has ever been in any community. Rigid honesty and incorrupt integrity characterized the merchants and office-holders. Defalcation and embezzlement were almost unknown; fraudulent bankruptcy was hardly dreamed of; and a breach of contract exposed the offender to open shame. As regards intemperance, there was probably less of hard drinking in the good society of Boston than in the same condition of life anywhere else; most of the leading men in Church and State are known to have been strictly sober and self-restraining in their habits; and it was among the ministers and laymen of the Unitarian churches in and about Boston that the earliest temperance society in the world had its origin, its principal officers, and its most efficient members.

As to all local charities Boston, though very far behind its present position, was a century ago in advance of its time. There was little enterprise, indeed, in seeking objects or inventing modes of charitable relief; but there was never wanting a general readiness to meet all known cases of poverty and suffering with prompt succor and faithful care.

In fine, it is but just to say, that, while Boston showed a wider departure from conventional orthodoxy of belief than any other community or vicinage in the United States, it was at least on a level with the best in the observances, sanctities, and moralities of the Christian life.

The precise extent of Unitarianism in the Congregational churches of Boston it is very difficult to determine, on account of the slight stress laid on differences that came in subsequent generations to be considered as of vital importance. Probably the Old South Church consisted for the most part of Trinitarians and moderate Calvinists, though there is reason to believe that their minister, Dr. Eckley, denied the supreme deity of

Christ. On the other hand, the Brattle-Square Church — foremost among the Boston churches in point of liberal views and professions — had for its minister, in 1780, Dr. Colman, undoubtedly a Trinitarian; and his immediate successor, Dr. Thacher, was always reckoned among the Calvinistic clergy. There remains no token to show that Mr. Wight, of the Hollis-Street Church, may not have been a Calvinist; yet there is ample reason to believe that his congregation was of the more liberal type. There was a small Presbyterian church in Long Lane, afterward Federal Street, consisting originally for the most part of persons of Scottish birth or parentage, who were extreme Calvinists;[1] but in 1787 the Presbyterian had been exchanged for the Congregational form of church government, and a Unitarian minister was then inducted into the pastoral office.

In the towns that have now become a part of Boston, it is believed that the church in Charlestown was the only one which, by a majority, adhered to the earlier faith of New England; and even here, in 1788, a Unitarian minister was the agent in securing for the church the services of that redoubtable champion of Orthodoxy, Rev. Dr. Morse, and preached his ordination sermon. Rev. Dr. Gordon, the historian, well known to have been a Calvinist, was pastor of the church at Jamaica Plain in 1780; but his society, while admiring him for his patriotic devotion to his adopted country, and loving him for his rare excellence, had but little sympathy with him in his theological opinions.

The First Church had for its senior pastor in 1780 Rev. Charles Chauncy, D.D., a descendant of the second President of Harvard College, a man of eminent ability and learning, and holding by a truly venerable character no less than by years the foremost place among his brethren.[2] He was conspicuous as the earnest antagonist of the dogma of eternal punishment, which, however it may have been called in question by individual thinkers, was generally regarded as an essential doctrine of the Gospel. With him was associated Rev. John Clarke, D.D., who possessed graces of style and an æsthetic culture to which his distinguished senior could lay but slender claim, and who while still in the meridian of life, though with a fully established reputation as a preacher and a minister, was struck down in his pulpit by a fatal attack of apoplexy.

In the Second Church the pulpit of the Mathers was occupied by Rev. John Lathrop, D.D.,[3] who, without remarkable powers, filled a singularly large place in the community, rendered important service as an officer or a leading member of numerous public institutions, was trusted, honored, and beloved as a man of faultless excellence, and after a ministry of half a century left a name second to none in the reverence of his own and the memory of succeeding generations.

Rev. John Eliot, D.D., was at that time pastor of the New North Church. He was well known in connection with historical researches and labors, and

[1] [See Vol. II. p. 225.—Ed.] [2] [A portrait of Dr. Chauncy is given in ch. vi. of Vol. II.—Ed.]
[3] [His portrait is given in Drake's *Boston*, p. 311. — Ed.]

at the same time had in his special calling a reputation for superior attainments as a scholar and ability as a writer, while his social gifts and the qualities of his character made his presence always welcome, whether in literary circles or in the homes of his parishioners.

The New South Church, which had been vacant from 1775, was filled in 1782 by the ordination of Rev. Oliver Everett, who, after a brief ministry, was succeeded by Rev. Mr. — afterward President — Kirkland.

In the West Church Dr. Mayhew had been succeeded by Rev. Simeon Howard, D.D., of whom the record runs that "his parishioners loved him as a brother and honored him as a father; his brethren in the ministry always met him with a grateful and cordial welcome; and the community at large reverenced him for his simplicity, integrity, and benevolence." It seems to have been well known from the time of his ordination that he was a Unitarian; and it is a token of the change that had meanwhile come over the theology of the Boston churches, that, while it was usual for ministers to apply for admission into the Boston Association, which he had omitted to do on account of the heretical reputation of his church, in 1784 the Association took the initiative, and appointed a committee to confer with him as to membership of that body.

In 1782 began a series of proceedings which brought Unitarianism prominently before the public. King's Chapel, the oldest Episcopal church in New England, had been left without a pastor by the flight of its royalist rector at the time of the evacuation of Boston; and the Old South congregation had held their services there, pending the repairs of their own house of worship, which had been used as a riding-school by the British troops. When this arrangement was about to terminate, the wardens of King's Chapel invited Mr. (afterward Dr.) James Freeman to become their minister. On resuming their stated worship, the majority of the proprietors found themselves no longer in the state of religious belief which the liturgy presupposes. They resolved, therefore, so to alter the established form of prayer as to exclude the recognition of the Trinity and the supreme deity of Christ. In aid of this enterprise Mr. Freeman preached a series of doctrinal sermons, which emphatically designated his own position and that of his church. The society still desiring to retain its connection with the Episcopal Church, Mr. Freeman applied for ordination to Bishop Seabury, of Connecticut, and then to Bishop Provoost, of New York, — to the latter not without reasonable hope of success; for American Episcopacy was still so far inorganic as to admit into its administration what would now seem the grossest irregularities. On the failure of these applications recourse was had to the doctrine of the Cambridge Platform, that the greater right of election, which resides in the members of the church, includes the lesser right of ordination. The validity of this ordination was assailed in the papers of the day; but it was warmly defended by Rev. Mr. (afterward Dr.) Belknap, who had just been installed as the first Congregational pastor of the church in Long Lane (Federal Street).

Dr. Belknap, not long afterward, performed a very important service for the non-Trinitarian churches in publishing a collection of psalms and hymns, which early came into general use, and has been superseded only within the memory of many now living. This volume is of interest as an index of the religious belief and feeling of the churches that welcomed its advent. It is full of tenderly devout and almost adoring reverence for



REV. JAMES FREEMAN, D.D.[1]

Christ, and recognizes his exalted rank and his sacrificial death, but omits or alters such portions of the hymns selected as confer on him the titles exclusively appropriate to God, and such as imply a plurality of divine persons. In the preparation and introduction of such a book as this we

[1] [This cut follows a portrait by Gilbert Stuart, belonging to Mrs. W. E. Prince, of Newport, to whom the editor is indebted for permission to copy it. Dr. Freeman was born in 1759, and died in 1835. He was the grandfather of the Rev. James Freeman Clarke, D.D. — Ed.]

have a clear refutation of the old charge of concealment; for no form of profession could be more public than the exclusion of wonted themes of sacred song from the stated services of the church.

During the last two decades of the last century, ecclesiastical quiet in the Congregational churches seems to have been wholly undisturbed. The differences of opinion were not ignored, but condoned. Ministers of both parties exchanged pulpits freely, sat together on church councils, and united in ordination and other public services. The first tokens, or rather premonitions, of a rupture occurred in 1808, in a controversy occasioned by the choice of Rev. Henry Ware, Sr., a well-known Unitarian, as Hollis Professor of Divinity at Harvard College. There can be but little doubt that this event either induced or hastened the foundation of the Andover Theological Seminary, and the establishment of the Park-Street Church, — the former destined to furnish earnest antagonists of Boston Unitarianism; the latter specially designed to check its ascendancy and to counteract its influence.

In 1811 we find the first symptoms of objection to the wonted system of pulpit exchanges, which was not, however, generally discontinued till 1819. In 1815 appeared in Boston, as was supposed at the instance of Dr. Morse, a reprint of an English pamphlet comprising a history of American Unitarianism, from documents and information furnished by Dr. Freeman and others, and published by Rev. Mr. Belsham. This was designed as a note of alarm, and was reviewed in the *Panoplist*, with the purpose of identifying the Unitarianism of Boston with that of Belsham, Priestley, and other English divines of the same extreme type. This identity was denied by the Rev. William E. Channing in a letter addressed to the Rev. Samuel C. Thacher, which led to a sharp controversy between Mr. Channing and the Rev. Dr. Worcester, of Salem. Mr. Channing was undoubtedly in the right as to the main intent of his first pamphlet; for, with possibly a single exception, the liberal clergy of Boston had as little sympathy as their Orthodox neighbors with the humanitarianism and materialism of their English brethren. But from this time the line between the two parties was distinctly drawn; and on both sides the controversy became vivid and earnest, and, though generally courteous, occasionally assumed a bitterness which may be ascribed to the time rather than to the combatants, for the best men of that day carried into their political contests an intensity of acrimony and of personal abuse, such as now finds tolerance only and hardly in the least reputable quarters.

Meanwhile, important changes had taken place in the Boston pulpit. Dr. Channing's power as a preacher had raised the Federal-Street Church to a commanding position and influence. He was first remarked chiefly for the unction and fervor of his sermons on the claims, duties, and prerogatives of the spiritual life, and was reluctantly drawn into controversy, which with him was a supposed necessity, — never a choice. While no man of his time wielded a keener pen, his polemic writings were but an interlude in a life spent for the most part on that higher plane on which good men of

all parties throw aside their arms, and with which his memory is now so intimately associated.

Mr. Buckminster, of the Brattle-Square Church, though decided and outspoken in his opinions, did not engage in controversy. He, if we may trust the recollections of those who were wont to hear him, was the Chrysostom of America. In countenance, voice, and gesture he had all the best

REV. JOSEPH S. BUCKMINSTER.[1]

gifts of an orator; and these were hallowed by profound religious feeling, and enriched by faultless rhetoric and a glowing imagination, which have not since been transcended, if equalled, in the Boston pulpit.

Buckminster was succeeded by Edward Everett, whose youthful, brilliant ministry gave promise of a not unequal fame, and whose subsequent career affords ample ground for regret that his first profession had not enjoyed in

[1] [This portrait follows a likeness by Stuart, owned by the late George W. Lyman, Esq. — Ed.]

after years the usufruct of the eloquence, learning, and ripened wisdom which have left their record in so many departments of literature and of public service. During his brief pastorate, — which lasted but little more than a year, — while he won high reputation as a preacher, he found time to write a defence of Christianity, in answer to an assault on the Christian religion and its records by George B. English. This is among the most able treatises on the Christian evidences which have appeared during the present century; and it has almost faded from the memory of man, simply because it was so close a hand-to-hand conflict that it could hardly survive, in the interest of the reading public, the book which it annihilated and tore in pieces, and of which the fragments remain like flies embedded in amber.

Everett was succeeded by the Rev. John G. Palfrey, D.D., whose ministry of nearly twenty years was characterized by ability — though on a different plane — by no means inferior to that of the men whose place he filled, and who until recently survived in feeble age, with mind undimmed, and in the full enjoyment of an undoubting Christian faith and a sight-like hope of immortality.

Among his coevals in the ministry we have space to name only Nathaniel L. Frothingham, D.D., a scholar, a poet of no mean gifts, and the master of a prose diction of rare and faultless elegance; Henry Ware, Jr., D.D., whose devotional fervor made his personal intercourse and his whole life a perpetual preaching of the gospel; Francis W. P. Greenwood, D.D., who has hardly been surpassed in the consecration of intensely vivid and lofty imaginative powers to the highest themes, and who made an invaluable contribution to the service of the sanctuary in the hymnal which held for many years deservedly the foremost place in the Unitarian churches; Alexander Young, D.D., a sound theologian, assiduous in the duties of his calling, and devoting his leisure to the fruitful study of literary antiquities and of American history; and Ezra S. Gannett, D.D., whose body, early crippled by paralysis, sustained for many years an unsurpassed amount of exhausting professional labor, and whose eloquent discourse, beneficent activity, and burning zeal, equally in behalf of his own views of truth and of every cause of human well-being, were as fresh and vigorous at three-score and ten as in the flush of youth.

Meanwhile, a change, which yet was hardly a change, had taken place in the creed of these younger Unitarians. Dr. Channing was an Arian (so-called), certainly during his active ministry, probably through life; so was Dr. Francis Parkman. But the pre-existence of Christ ceased to be generally maintained. Yet the Boston clergy of that day were not humanitarians in the common acceptation of that word. Christ held in their reverence a place far above humanity. He was a being so inspired and empowered by God, that the highest titles and attributes, not essentially divine, were his of right. He was sinless, infallible, ever present with his Church, the dispenser of all spiritual gifts, the judge of men. In fine, he was the central object of religious trust, love, and aspiration; and this, not by virtue of aught apper-

taining to his humanity, but by the power, wisdom, and love of God, incarnated in him as in no other being in the universe.

Under this dispensation, after the lull of the Trinitarian controversy, for a decade or more the Liberal churches enjoyed rest, peace among themselves, growing esteem from their fellow-Christians, and all the tokens of an established and even increasing prosperity. During this period and the few preceding years the number of new Unitarian churches was larger, we think, than that of those built by any other denomination, and there was hardly one of the churches — old or new — that was not generously sustained and respectably well filled.

In 1825 was formed the American Unitarian Association, which has always had its headquarters and held its meetings in Boston. This Association has supported a publishing and a missionary agency, has been recognized in and out of the denomination as its special organization for propagandism, and now possesses permanent trust-funds amounting to about two hundred thousand dollars, and derives from the churches an annual income ranging from one fourth to half that amount.

In 1826 the Rev. Joseph Tuckerman, D.D., who had been for a quarter of a century minister of Chelsea, began his labors among the poor and the religiously destitute in Boston, and under his auspices a permanent "ministry at large" was established. There had been, indeed, previously much missionary labor among the poorer classes, and the Boston Sunday-schools of all denominations were from the first to a very large extent missionary schools; but it is believed that the enterprise of Dr. Tuckerman was the earliest organized effort in that direction. Its success and its permanent establishment as an institution were due in great measure to its founder's strenuous perseverance, his self-sacrifice, his apostolic fervor of spirit, and the power of his influence. The association that has this work in charge is termed the Benevolent Fraternity of Churches, and consists of delegates from all the Unitarian churches in what used to be Boston, — Roxbury and Charlestown retaining the methods of charitable work in use at the time of their annexation. The Fraternity has generally supported from three to five missionaries, and assumes the charge of three chapels, besides rendering important aid in other ways to the religious instruction of the poor.

Early in the fourth decade of the century there arose in the Unitarian churches in and around Boston an earnest discussion growing out of the type of philosophy which bore the somewhat vague name of Transcendentalism. Ralph Waldo Emerson, it was understood, resigned his pastorate, not for lack of faith or reverence, but because the forms of the Church were inadequate to express his intuitions of spiritual truth. The Rev. George Ripley, who remained several years longer in the ministry, held the foremost place as the expounder and champion of the new theology, which may, perhaps, best be characterized as hyper-spiritualism; and Professor Andrews Norton was regarded as its chief antagonist.[1] The controversy was fully as much philosophi-

[1] [See Mr. Ripley's kind characterization of Professor Norton in Vol. IV. — Ed.]

cal as religious; and, so far as it found its way into the churches, it related less to the doctrines of the New Testament than to the proof of their validity. It may be that both parties were equally in the wrong, — the one in laying on external evidence a greater stress than in the nature of the case it can bear; the other, in ignoring all testimony to spiritual truth except that of individual consciousness, and thus by inevitable implication rendering objective truth inconceivable. The peculiar type of speculation represented in these movements seemed to have a very brief currency; yet it had a large and permanent influence in and beyond the denomination in which it first came to light, in both broadening and deepening the philosophy of religion, and in diffusing more just views of the relative importance, on the one hand, of fundamental truths, and on the other of the facts that authenticate them, and the dogmas that are their more or less approximate expression.

In 1841 Theodore Parker, in an ordination sermon at South Boston, started a controversy of deeper significance. He expressly denied the authenticity of all that is supernatural in the Gospel narrative; while he represented Jesus Christ as pre-eminently the Providential man, the greatest of all teachers of spiritual and ethical doctrine and duty, and maintained the literal truth of the text which he had taken, — "My words shall not pass away." His sermon was received at the outset with general alarm and disapproval. He was asked to withdraw from the Association of Ministers to which he belonged, and, though he declined to do this, his relations of clerical intercourse and pulpit exchange were thenceforward confined to very few of its members. His following, however, rapidly increased. He soon became minister of a new congregation, which, including transient hearers, was probably the largest in Boston; and he was recognized by those who had no sympathy with his negations as a man of fervent piety, of a thoroughly upright purpose, and of self-sacrificing philanthropy. His opinions have now undoubtedly not a few adherents among both the clergy and the laity, and are represented — in some cases, it may be, exaggerated — in what may be termed the "left wing" of the denomination in Boston and elsewhere.

Meanwhile, there has been on the part of the "right wing" a growing affinity to the more liberal of the Trinitarian Congregationalists, in the tendency to regard Christ's humanity as divine in a sense supreme and sole; so that the probably spurious reading of the long-disputed passage in St. Paul's Epistle to Timothy, "God manifest in the flesh," would be adopted equally on either side as the most appropriate designation of Christ's true place in the faith of his Church and in the spiritual universe.

Of the Unitarian clergymen now living we, of course, cannot speak; and of their coevals who have passed away, while there are, as we believe, none of whom we might not make honorable mention, our limits will permit us to name but two, both of whom were distinguished equally by the conspicuous positions which they filled, and by the large place which they held in the

confidence, respect, and affection of the whole community. Ephraim Peabody, D.D., for ten years minister of King's Chapel, while able and intensely impressive as a preacher, was pre-eminently "a man of the beatitudes;" and the lapse of a quarter of a century since his death cannot have made his memory dim or less precious in the minds of the many who hardly have known, or expect to know in this world, his like. George Putnam, D.D., for nearly fifty years pastor of the First Church in Roxbury, had few equals in his profession in vigor of intellect, in directness and force of logical statement and rhetorical appeal, and in the command of an audience of the highest culture and receptivity. At the same time, those who knew him best saw in him a reserved power which, if fully put forth, would have insured for him, in any profession or department, a far-diffused and long-enduring fame.

The Unitarian churches in Boston, though numerous, and several of them in a very prosperous condition, occupy at the present time a much less prominent place than they held a century ago. They then embraced the larger part of the men eminent for ability, worth, and beneficence, and most of the principal merchants, lawyers, and physicians. Of these they have now their fair proportion, probably not more. Their growth has undoubtedly been checked, and their integrity impaired, by the successive controversies to which reference has been made, and also by the absence of an authoritative standard of doctrine, and the wide divergence of opinion among the leading ministers and members. Whether such a standard is in itself desirable, or whether greater unanimity of belief is attainable without a sacrifice of independent thought, it is not the province of history to determine or consider.

The Unitarian denomination has been ably represented in the periodical literature of Boston from the early years of the present century. *The Monthly Anthology*, a literary and theological magazine, was begun in 1804, and had among its contributors Buckminster, Norton, and almost all the younger scholars and divines of Boston and Cambridge. This, after eight years of brilliant reputation, was succeeded for two years by the *General Repository and Review*, under similar auspices, but with a wider scope. In 1813 the Rev. Noah Worcester began the editorship of the *Christian Disciple*, which in 1824 was virtually merged in the *Christian Examiner*. This last had for its editors at different times Doctors Palfrey, Walker, Greenwood, Lamson, Gannett, Putnam, G. E. Ellis, Hedge, and Hale, and was for several years under the sole charge of the Rev. William Ware, better known as the author of *Zenobia* and *Probus*. For the forty-five years of its existence it was distinguished for its literary merit as well as for its learned and skilled discussion of theological subjects. Its place has been taken, and in part filled, by the *Unitarian Review*, which — more popular in character — contains many articles of large and permanent interest, and in which Dr. Ezra Abbot's monograph on the genuineness of the fourth Gospel — by far the most learned and thorough discussion of this subject which has

appeared on either side of the Atlantic — was first printed in successive numbers. Other monthlies have had a shorter life, some of them dying, not prematurely, though early; and some, well worthy of a longer existence, had the material means of support been afforded.

The principal newspaper, — the organ of the denomination, if, indeed, it has an organ, — the *Christian Register*, has reached its sixtieth year, and has had at various times the editorial services of men of distinguished reputation.

From the Boston press have been issued not a few specifically Unitarian works in exposition or defence of the doctrines of the denomination, as well as very many volumes of sermons and essays by its leading clergymen. It is enough to say of these that they have, in general, equally indicated and cherished a high order of literary taste, attainment, and culture.

UNITARIAN CHURCHES IN BOSTON, AND THEIR MINISTERS.

The ministers to whose names † is affixed are not known to have been Unitarians; those to whose names ‡ is affixed are known not to have been Unitarians. The first date annexed to the names of the ministers is that of ordination or installation; the second that of dismissal or death. The date joined to the designation of the church is that of its foundation.

First Church, 1630.

Charles Chauncy . 1727—1787
John Clarke . . . 1778—1798
William Emerson . 1799—1811
John L. Abbot . . 1813—1814
Nathaniel L. Frothingham . . . . 1815—1850
Rufus Ellis . . . 1853—

Second Church,[1] 1650.

John Lathrop . . 1768—1816
Henry Ware, Jr. . 1817—1830
Ralph W. Emerson 1829—1832
Chandler Robbins . 1833—1875
Robert Laird Collier 1876—1878
Edward A. Horton 1880—

King's Chapel, 1689.

James Freeman, . 1782—1835
Samuel Cary . . . 1809—1815
Francis W. P. Greenwood . . . . 1824—1843
Ephraim Peabody . 1846—1856
Henry W. Foote . 1861—

Church in Brattle Square, 1699.

Samuel Cooper ‡ . 1746—1783
Peter Thacher ‡ . . 1705—1802
Joseph S. Buckminster . . . . 1805—1812
Edward Everett . 1814—1815
John G. Palfrey . . 1818—1830
Samuel K. Lothrop 1834–1876[2]

New North Church, 1714.

John Eliot . . . 1779—1813
Francis Parkman . 1813—1849
Amos Smith . . . 1842—1848
Joshua Young . . 1849—1852
Arthur B. Fuller . 1853—1858
Robert C. Waterston[3] . . . . . 1859—1861
William R. Alger . 1863[4]—

New South Church, 1719.

Moses Everett . . 1782—1792
John T. Kirkland . 1794—1810
Samuel C. Thacher 1811—1818
Francis W. P. Greenwood . . . . . 1818—1821
Alexander Young . 1825—1854
Orville Dewey . . 1858—1861
William P. Tilden . 1862 [5]—

Federal-Street Church, 1727.

Jeremy Belknap . 1787—1798
John S. Popkin † . 1799—1802
Wm. E. Channing . 1803—1842
Ezra S. Gannett . 1824—1871
John F. W. Ware . 1872—

Hollis-Street Church, 1732.

Ebenezer Wight † . 1778—1788
Samuel West . . 1789—1808
Horace Holley . . 1809—1818
John Pierpont . . 1819—1845
David Fosdick . . 1846—1847
Thomas S. King . 1848—1860
George L. Chaney . 1862—1877
Henry B Carpenter 1879—

[1] In 1854 this church took possession of the church edifice belonging to the Church of the Saviour, which was merged in the Second Church.

[2] This church was dissolved in 1876.

[3] Not installed.

[4] At this time the New North united with the Bulfinch-Street Church, retaining its name.

[5] In 1866 this church was merged in the New South Free Church, of which Mr. Tilden became and remains pastor.

West Church, 1737.

Jonathan Mayhew . 1747—1766
Simeon Howard . 1767—1804
Charles Lowell . . 1806—1861
Cyrus A. Bartol . 1837—

Bulfinch-Street Church,[1] 1822.

Paul Dean . . . 1823—1840
Frederic T Gray . 1839—1853
William R. Alger[2] 1855—

Twelfth Congregational Church, 1825.

Samuel Barrett . . 1825—1861
Joseph Lovering 1860–1861[3]

Thirteenth Congregational Church, 1825.

George Ripley . . 1826—1841
Jas. I. T. Coolidge . 1842–1858[4]

South Congregational Church, 1827.

Mellish I. Motte . 1828—1842
Frederic D. Huntington . . . . 1842—1855
Edward E. Hale . 1856—

Church of the Disciples, 1841.[5]

James F. Clarke . 1841—

Church of the Saviour,[6] 1845.

Robert C. Waterston . . . . . 1845—1852

Indiana-Street Congregational Church,[7] 1845.

Thomas B. Fox . . 1845—1855

Church of the Unity, 1857.

Geo. H. Hepworth 1858—1869
Martin K. Schermerhorn . . . . . 1870—1874
Minot J. Savage . 1875—

Church of the Redeemer, 1864.

Caleb D. Bradlee . 1864—1872

Hawes-Place Church, 1819.

Zechariah Wood ‡ . 1819—1822
Lemuel Capen[8] . 1827—1839
Chas. C. Shackford 1841—1843
George W. Lippitt . 1844—1851
Thomas Dawes . . 1854—1861
James T. Hewes . 1862—1864
Frederic Hinckley . 1865—1867
George A. Thayer 1869—1873
Herman Bisbee . . 1874—1879
John F. Dutton . . 1880—

Second Hawes Church, 1845.

Moses G. Thomas . 1846—1848
Edmund Squire . . 1852–1853[9]
George A. Thayer . 1873—

Church in Washington Village, 1857.

Edmund Squire . . 1857—1861
A. S Ryder . . . 1861—1868
James Sallaway . 1868—

Second Congregational Church in East Boston, 1845.

Leonard J. Livermore . . . . 1847—1851
Warren H. Cudworth . . . . 1852 —

First Church in Roxbury, 1630.

Eliphalet Porter . 1782—1833
George Putnam . . 1830—1876
John G. Brooks . . 1875—

Mount Pleasant Church (Roxbury), 1846.

William R. Alger . 1847—1854
Alfred P. Putnam . 1855—1864
Charles J. Bowen . 1865—1870
Carlos C. Carpenter 1870—1879
William H. Lyon[10] 1880—

First Church in West Roxbury, 1712.

Thomas Abbot † . 1773—1783
John Bradford . . 1785—1825
John Flagg . . . 1825—1831
George Whitney . 1831—1836
Theodore Parker . 1837—1846
Dexter Clapp . . 1848—1851
Edmund B. Willson 1852—1859
T. B. Forbush . . 1863—1868
Augustus M. Haskell 1870—

First Church in Jamaica Plain, 1770.

William Gordon ‡ . 1772—1786
Thomas Gray . . 1793—1847
George Whitney . 1836—1842
Joseph H. Allen . 1843—1847
Grindall Reynolds . 1848–1858
Jas. W. Thompson . 1859—
Charles F. Dole . 1876—

First Church in Dorchester, 1630.

Moses Everett . . 1774—1793
Thaddeus M. Harris 1793—1836
Nathaniel Hall . . 1835–1875
Samuel J. Barrows . 1876—1881

Third Church in Dorchester, 1813.

Edward Richmond . 1817—1842
Francis Cunningham . . . . . 1834—1842
Richard Pike . . 1843–1863
Thos. J. Mumford . 1864–1871
Henry G. Spaulding 1873—1877
George M. Bodge . 1879—

Church in Harrison Square, 1848.

Francis C. Williams 1849—1850
Samuel Johnson . 1850—1851
Stephen G. Bulfinch 1852—1863
Joseph B. Marvin . 1865—1866
Frederic Hinckley . 1867—1869
Henry C. Badger . 1871—1874
Nathaniel Seaver . 1875—1876
Caleb D. Bradlee . 1876—

[1] Originally a Universalist church. Mr. Dean changed his ecclesiastical relations several years before Mr Gray's settlement.

[2] This church migrated with its pastor to the Music Hall, where it had a brief period of prosperity, then sank into decline and dissolution.

[3] Dissolved in 1863.

[4] Dissolved shortly after Mr. Coolidge's dismission.

[5] United with Indiana-Street Church in 1855.

[6] United with the Second Church in 1854.

[7] United with the Church of the Disciples in 1855.

[8] Mr. Capen began supplying the pulpit in 1823.

[9] Suspended from 1855 to 1857.

[10] Not installed.

CHURCH OF THE UNITY (NEPONSET), 1859.

Frederic W. Holland	1859—1862
Saml. W. McDaniel	1864—1866
Hasket D. Catlin	1867—1870
Albert C. Nickerson	1871—1879
Charles B. Elder	1880—

FIRST CHURCH IN BRIGHTON, 1783.

John Foster	1784—1829
Daniel Austin	1828—1838
Abner D. Jones	1839—1842
Frederic A. Whitney	1843—1857
Charles Noyes	1860—1863
Saml. W. McDaniel	1867—1869
Thomas Timmins	1870–1871
Edward I. Galvin	1872—1876
William Brunton	1877—

HARVARD CHURCH (CHARLESTOWN), 1816.

Thomas Prentiss	1817–1817
James Walker	1818—1839
George E. Ellis	1840—1869
Charles E. Grinnell	1869—1873
Pitt Dillingham	1876—

HARVARD CHAPEL (CHARLESTOWN), 1846.

Nathaniel S. Folsom	1846—1849
Oliver C. Everett	1850—1869
Charles F. Barnard	1869—1878

BULFINCH-STREET CHAPEL,[1] 1826.

Joseph Tuckerman	1826—1840
Frederic T. Gray	1834—1839
Robert C Waterston	1839—1845
Andrew Bigelow	1845—1846
Samuel H. Winkley	1846—

WARREN-STREET CHAPEL, 1834.

Charles F. Barnard	1834—1866
Wm. G. Babcock	1865—

SUFFOLK-STREET CHAPEL, 1839.

John T. Sargent	1837—1844
Samuel B. Cruft[2]	1846—1861

HANOVER-STREET CHAPEL, 1854.

W. G. Scandlin	1854–1858
Edwin J. Gerry	1858—

CONCORD-STREET CHAPEL, 1864.

J. E. Risley †	1864—1865
Wm. E. Copeland[3]	1864—1866

Andrew Preston Peabody.

[1] Established by Dr. Tuckerman. The society has worshipped in chapels successively in Friend, Pitts, and Bulfinch streets.

[2] The church merged in the New South Free Church.

[3] The church merged in the New South Free Church.

CHAPTER XII.

THE CENTURY OF UNIVERSALISM.

BY THE REV. A. A. MINER, D.D.,

Pastor of the Columbus-Avenue Universalist Church.

PREVIOUS to the opening of the history of organized Universalism in Boston in 1785, the subject of human destiny had awakened an especial interest. Half a century earlier there had arisen here and there a star of promise, and the query was anxiously pondered, whether God had not something better in store for his children than was commonly believed? The type of Christianity then prevalent in all its features was strongly Calvinistic. The mere suggestion that these doctrines might not be true, though condemned by the bigoted, was received by others with profound though often silent, satisfaction.

Symptoms of dissent appeared at no very great intervals of time from three widely different sources. The Arminian drift of thought rejected the dogmas of election and reprobation, and culminated in the organization of the now wide-spread Methodist Episcopal Church. The revolution in theological opinion herein involved was relatively slight. To the Socinian spirit the doctrine of the Trinity was especially obnoxious, — and the Unitarian Church is the result. Deeper and broader than both these was a revulsion from the whole catalogue of doctrines so logically knit together, moulded by the assumption of the infinite wrath of God, and resulting in the endless and unmitigated woe of the vast majority of mankind in all ages of the world. Substituting for that wrath the infinite love of God, burning as a purifying fire toward even the most sinful, it not only breathed a new spirit into the science of theology in general, but specially replaced the doctrine of endless punishment with the glad hopes of universal salvation. Out of these hopes have sprung the Universalist churches.

Among the foregleams of this faith, and the earliest of them in this country, was the preaching of Dr. George de Benneville, who was born in London, of French refugees. Persecuted in England, he went to France, where, in addition to imprisonment for his heresy, he came near suffering the penalty of death. Emigrating to the United States in 1741, he settled in Berks County, Pennsylvania, practising as a physician and preaching

the Word without fee or reward.[1] Two other distinguished preachers of Universalism, widely removed from each other, arose at about the same time in our country, — namely, the Rev. Richard Clarke, of Charleston, South Carolina, and Dr. Jonathan Mayhew, minister of the West Church in Boston. Of the latter the author of *The Modern History of Universalism* says: —

"He was distinguished by great force and acuteness of mind, and for the originality and independence of his investigations. His writings gained him great credit in Europe, and procured him a diploma of D.D. from the University of Aberdeen. From 1747 to 1766 he held the office above-mentioned, and shone as a bright star in the constellation of the American clergy of that age."[2]

Within four years of the close of Dr. Mayhew's ministry John Murray landed at Good Luck, New Jersey. Mr. Murray was born Dec. 10, 1741, in the town of Alton, Hampshire County, England, forty-eight miles west-southwest of London. His youth was marked by many extraordinary incidents. His religious experiences involved many vicissitudes. His father was an Episcopalian, his mother a Presbyterian. His own sympathies were early and deeply enlisted in Mr. Wesley, and so continued until by more mature thought he became a disciple of James Relly.[3] Having become a husband and father, he was called to the severest affliction in the death of both wife and child, which, followed by various other calamities, led him to seek the solitudes of the New World.[4]

Landing at Good Luck, September, 1770, Mr. Murray was both surprised and disturbed to be forbidden the solitude he sought. No sooner did his ship appear off shore than one Potter assumed that it contained the preacher he had long been waiting for. A series of providential incidents induced him to preach in the church that his new friend Potter had built.[5] Though

[1] *Modern Hist. of Universalism*, pp. 305–310.

[2] *Modern Hist. of Universalism*, pp. 312–315. [See also Dr. Peabody's and Dr. Goddard's chapters in this volume. — Ed.]

[3] The Rev. James Relly, an Englishman, and author of a work entitled *Relly's Union*, believed in the Trinity, in the ruin of man through Adam, and his redemption through Christ. He believed that the redemption was as absolute and universal as the ruin. But he distinguished between redemption and salvation. The redemption in Christ, by a decree of God who orders all things, was at once universal and complete; but salvation, resulting from a knowledge of that redemption, is not yet universal, but is destined to become so. Those who are saved here will join Christ in the air at his second coming, and will not be called to judgment. The spirits of those who die unsaved will wander in disquietude till Christ's coming, when they will be brought to judgment, and their sins will be separated from them. Thereupon the Book of Life, in which are written the names of the whole human race, will be opened, and they will be declared the denizens of the Kingdom of God. Then salvation also will have become universal.

In this fanciful gospel scheme, a marked variation of the Calvinistic type, Mr. Murray is supposed to have closely followed Relly. *Murray's Life and Letters, edition*, 1816.

[4] *Life of John Murray*, edition of 1869, chs. i.–iv.

[5] "As Murray went on shore for food, Potter refused to sell him fish, but made him welcome to whatever he wanted. He declined to make an appointment for preaching, as he must sail the moment the wind should change. This refusal, on the same ground, was repeated day after day. Finally, Potter insisted that the wind would not change until Murray should have delivered his message. A conditional appointment was made; Murray preached in Potter's church, the wind changed, and the ship immediately set sail." — *Life of John Murray*, ch. v.

he had been a preacher of Rellyism in his native country, it was his deliberate purpose to permit his voice to be heard in public no more. But "while man appoints, God disappoints." No sooner had he once spoken to the people on these shores than his services were in pressing demand. Possessed of marked abilities, a vivid imagination, a warm heart and ready wit, he was everywhere heard with intensest pleasure. Having spent nearly two years in New York, Philadelphia, and the principal towns around and between those cities, Mr. Murray, in the fall of 1772, visited New England, preaching in various towns in Connecticut, and in both Providence and Newport, Rhode Island.[1] His contemplated visit to Boston was prevented by the approach of winter, which he spent in revisiting the scenes of his previous labors, and journeying as far south even as Maryland. In the autumn of 1773 he returned to New England, rejected an invitation to abide in Newport, preached in East Greenwich and Providence, arriving in Boston October 26 of the same year. This was his first visit to the metropolis of New England. His already great fame had preceded him. His first discourse in Boston was delivered in the hall of the Manufactory House, — a large building opposite the site on which Park-Street Church now stands.[2] Among his earliest acquaintances here was Thomas Handasyde Peck, who rendered him great assistance and opened his dwelling-house for public worship. Mr. Murray became still more widely known by journeying to Newburyport and as far as Portsmouth, New Hampshire, preaching in various pulpits in both these places. On returning to Boston he again preached in the Manufactory House, in Faneuil Hall, and in the meeting-house of the Rev. Mr. Croswell, of whom Mr. Peck, just mentioned, was a chief supporter. This house was situated on School Street, on the lot next east of

[1] "On his way to Newport on horseback, Mr. Murray held a characteristic conversation. He fell in with one Rev. Mr. Hopkins, of Newport, who, in reply to a remark of Mr. Murray, said: 'If such be your views, you know nothing at all of gospel.' — 'You could not so absolutely determine this matter if you yourself were not acquainted with the meaning of the term "gospel." Tell me then, sir, if you please, what is gospel?' — 'Why, sir, this is gospel: "He that believeth shall be saved; and he that believeth not shall be damned."' — 'Indeed, sir, I had thought the literal, simple meaning of the term "gospel" was *glad tidings*. Which part of the passage you have cited is gospel, — that which announces *salvation*, or that which announces *damnation?*' — 'Well, then, if you please, this is gospel: "He that believeth shall be saved."' — 'Believeth what, sir?' — 'That.' — 'What, sir?' — 'That, I tell you.' — 'What, sir?' — 'That, I tell you, "He that believeth shall be saved."' — '*Believeth what*, sir? What is he to believe?' — 'Why, that, I tell you.' — 'I wished, sir, to treat this investigation seriously, but as you seem disposed to be rather ludicrous, we will, if you please, dismiss the subject.' — 'No, sir, I do not mean to be ludicrous; I am very serious.' — 'Well, sir, if so, then I beg leave to ask, What is it I am to believe, the believing of which will save me?' — 'That Jesus Christ made it possible for sinners to be saved.' — 'By what means?' — 'By believing.' — 'Believing what?' — 'That.' — 'What?' — 'That Jesus Christ made it possible for sinners to be saved.' — 'By what means is it possible that sinners may be saved?' — 'By believing, I tell you.' — 'But the devils! will their believing save them?' — 'No, sir.' — 'Suppose I believe that Jesus Christ made it possible to save sinners, will that save me?' — 'No, sir.' — 'Then, sir, let me ask, What am I to believe, the believing of which will save me?' — 'Why, sir, you must believe the gospel, that Jesus made it possible for sinners to be saved.' — 'But by what means?' — 'By believing.' — 'Believing what?' — '*That*, I tell you.'" — *Life of John Murray*, pp. 247–48.

[2] *Life of John Murray*, p. 284. [See also Vol. II. of this History, pp. xxvi. and 511. — Ed.]

the School-Street block, on which the meeting-house of the Second Universalist Society recently stood.[1] Subsequently he again journeyed south, and in the spring of 1774 turned his face northward, reaching Boston again in September of that year. During the autumn he preached at the Manufactory House, in the dwelling-house of his friend, Mr. Peck, and at Faneuil

John Murray

Hall. Such crowds attended upon his ministry as led many of the proprietors of Mr. Croswell's meeting-house to solicit him to minister therein. The house was opened to him against the wishes of Mr. Croswell, who violently opposed him, and on subsequent occasions endeavored to prevent him from entering the pulpit. Mr. Murray was even assailed with vituperation by Mr. Croswell and others, to whom he replied with such calmness and Chris-

[1] *Life of John Murray*, p. 291.

tian dignity as most favorably to affect the public mind. So riotous, however, were his opponents that on a subsequent occasion, on entering the pulpit, —

"He found that the cushions had been sprinkled with a noxious drug, the strong effluvia from which almost prevented his speaking. In the midst of the service many stones were violently thrown through the windows, and much alarm was excited. . . . Lifting one of these, weighing about a pound and a half, and waving it in view of the people, he remarked, 'This argument is solid and weighty, but it is neither rational nor convincing.' Though earnestly besought to leave the pulpit, as his life was in danger, he steadfastly refused, declaring himself immortal while any duty remained to him on earth. In this scene culminated the riotous opposition to Universalism in Boston." [1]

Visiting Gloucester on November 3, he preached several times at the request of the deacons and elders of the principal parish; but opposition was at length raised against him from the pastor and others. So violent did this opposition become, partly on account of his Universalism, partly because he was an Englishman, that attempts were made to drive him from the town. His friends, however, proved as devoted as his enemies were virulent.

The War of the Revolution opened. Mr. Murray, in May, 1775, was appointed chaplain to the Rhode Island brigade. The other chaplains of the army united in petitioning General Washington for his removal, and were answered in the General Orders of the next day, Sept. 17, 1775, appointing the Rev. John Murray chaplain to the three Rhode Island regiments, and commanding that he be respected accordingly. Mr. Murray, very unwisely as General Washington thought, returned the commission forwarded to him, earnestly requesting permission to continue in the army as a volunteer.[2]

On leaving the army he returned to his friends in Gloucester, who organized a society in January, 1779. Shortly after this a controversy arose of great importance in respect to the maintenance of Universalist societies in any part of the Commonwealth. It involved the right of the people to appropriate their contributions for public worship to such religious teachers as they might choose, being delivered at the same time from the payment of taxes to the old parishes. The subject was hotly contested. Goods and chattels were seized by an officer for parish taxes, and sold at public auction. Legal steps were then instituted to recover the moneys thus distrained. The result was long doubtful. The trial was begun in 1783, and continued with various fortune till 1786. The decision was favorable to Mr. Murray, in whose name the suit was brought, and to his friends, who were the real plaintiffs in the case. The judge, holding for some time an adverse view, became clearly in favor of the broadest religious liberty; and the jury, after an all-night session, returned a verdict for the plaintiff. This decision opened

[1] *Life of John Murray*, ch. vi. [2] *Life of John Murray*, p. 317.

the way for the establishment of Universalist parishes, free from all legal disabilities.[1]

Before speaking of the organization of churches in Boston, to which the foregoing was but so many preparatory steps, I must call attention to an incident connected with the First Church, of which the Rev. Rufus Ellis, D.D., is now pastor. Dr. Charles Chauncy, its pastor at the time of the above-mentioned struggles, then nearly eighty years of age, had thirty years before undertaken a critical study of the Scriptures, particularly of St. Paul's Epistles, with such helps as he could command from either side of the Atlantic. To his surprise he found Universalism to be the doctrine therein taught. The result of these studies was a manuscript work entitled *The Salvation of All Men*, about the publication of which he for a long time hesitated. In 1782, a pamphlet upon the subject, commonly attributed to him, appeared anonymously in Boston and aroused violent prejudice, calling forth pointed attacks from various quarters, among which those of Dr. Samuel Mather, of Boston, and Dr. Gordon, of Roxbury, were conspicuous. Thereupon Dr. Chauncy sent his principal work to London,[2] where it appeared anonymously in 1784. To this work, tedious in many of its details, though on the whole able, the younger President Edwards, in 1790, published a vigorous but undiscriminating reply.[3]

Meantime the First Universalist Church in Boston had been organized. The public heart, so deeply stirred in various ways, was ready to embody in visible form its protest against long-standing barbarisms. On Dec. 25, 1785, a meeting-house on the corner of Hanover and North Bennet streets was purchased by Shippie Townsend, James Prentiss, Jonathan Stoddard, John Page, and Josiah Snelling, for the small society of Universalists gathered under the labors of Mr. Murray, largely aided by the Rev. Adam Streeter. This was the church in which the Rev. Samuel Mather, already mentioned as an opponent of Mr. Murray, had ministered down to the time of his death. It was erected in 1741, — the year in which Mr. Murray was born, — and was enlarged by its new proprietors in 1792; repaired and further enlarged in 1806, during which the society worshipped in Faneuil Hall; again repaired and to some extent remodelled in 1824 and 1828, and demolished in 1838, preparatory to the erection of the present brick edifice on the same spot, dedicated Jan. 1, 1839. The last service in it was held June 24, 1838, the Rev. Sebastian Streeter discoursing to an audience filling the house to repletion, from Ps. lxxvii. 11: "I will remember the works of the Lord; surely I will remember thy wonders of old."[4]

This little band of sturdy believers, happily sheltered in their new Sunday home, was ministered to regularly by the Rev. George Richards, though

[1] *Life of John Murray*, pp. 324–36.

[2] [One reason was that no printing office in Boston had the Greek or other necessary type. See *Belknap Papers*, i. 172. — Ed.]

[3] *Modern History of Universalism*, edition of 1830, pp. 347–51.

[4] Most of these and kindred facts in the sketch of parishes are gathered directly or indirectly from parish records, — quite too meagre in incident, — and need not be specially referred to. Those here stated will be found in the *Life of John Murray*, p. 339.

various other preachers, among whom Mr. Murray was conspicuous, were occasionally heard. Though settled at Gloucester Mr. Murray continued his travels far and near, cheering believers, confirming the doubting, comforting the sorrowing, and extending the blessings of the kingdom. Seven or eight years were thus spent, when the Boston society called Mr. Murray to be its pastor. He was installed Oct. 24, 1793, by Deacon Oliver W. Lane, as the record states, "in a very appropriate and affecting manner." This proved to be a most happy and useful pastorate, continuing uninterrupted during twenty-two years, till the death of Mr. Murray, Sept. 3, 1815. In the later

THE FIRST UNIVERSALIST MEETING-HOUSE.

period of his life, weighed down by almost insupportable infirmities, he was carried into the pulpit in the arms of his devoted friends, and, seated in his easy chair, delivered his messages of grace.

Few men have possessed such powers of persuasion as did he. To quick sensibilities, strong, pure, and enduring domestic affections, a breadth and fulness of Christian love that nothing could either repress or limit, were joined great penetration, an intuitive knowledge of human nature, and the most exuberant cheerfulness. Such qualities command the confidence of men, awaken their affections, and purify their hearts. Such qualities enabled him, when but a young man, to throw himself into the midst of a London mob during the Wilkes troubles, hush the clamor, soothe the rioters, and save many valuable lives, besides much property. A nobleman seizing him by the hand impressively said, "Young man, I thank you. I am ignorant of your name; but I bear testimony to your wonderful

abilities. By your exertions much blood and treasure have this night been saved."[1]

So great were the infirmities of Mr. Murray that for some years before his death an assistant was employed. The Rev. Edward Mitchell, of New York, became colleague, Sept. 12, 1810, and filled that office till Oct. 6, 1811. He was succeeded by the Rev. Paul Dean, — an eloquent and ambitious man whom we shall again have occasion to mention, — October, 1813, who became sole pastor after the death of Mr. Murray, continuing till April 6, 1823. May 13, 1824, the Rev. Sebastian Streeter, of saintly memory, entered upon his charge of the parish. This proved far the longest and most fruitful of all the pastorates which the church enjoyed. For nearly thirty years he went in and out before them as their sole pastor, — a truly apostolic presence. Often did his eloquent ministrations deeply touch the hearts of parents as they brought their babes to the altar for christening; of the mourning, as bending over their dead he unveiled to them the life immortal; and of the glad assemblages gathered to witness the solemn interchange of marriage vows. Of these last alone more than thirty-five hundred couples received his patriarchal benediction. Among the means of usefulness in this church the Friday-evening prayer-meeting ever held a conspicuous place.





In Mr. Streeter's advancing age it became necessary to relieve him of some of the more active duties of the pastorate. The Rev. Sumner Ellis was installed as colleague, Nov. 11, 1851, and resigned the office, Dec. 25, 1853. He was succeeded by the Rev. Noah M. Gaylord, who was installed March 14, 1855, and continued, excepting a brief interval, to minister until his resignation, Oct. 28, 1860. Both these young men brought excellent talents to the service of the church. Mr. Ellis, then quite young, has since risen to a position of influence, whence with voice and pen he greatly promotes the kingdom of Christ. Mr. Gaylord, after a term of service in the army, died in the full vigor of manhood.

The lack of outward prosperity in the church during their connection with it is attributable to causes quite beyond their control. The old North End, once the principal part of the city and the seat of all its great interests, had come to be occupied chiefly by a foreign-born population, from whose presence the former residents had in large numbers retired. This social revolution greatly affected the Protestant churches in general of that locality, and the First Universalist Church was no exception. For a year following Mr. Gaylord's resignation the church was closed. At length, however, services were resumed in the lecture-room, Nov. 3, 1861, which were so largely attended that on December 29 they were transferred to the

[1] *Life of John Murray*, p. 381.

auditorium. The ministry of the Rev. Thomas W. Silloway, under whom this success was achieved, closed May 29, 1864, when the parish yielded to the inevitable. Its entire history covered a period of about seventy-nine years, which was mainly prosperous. The only other exception was an episode connected with the ministry of Mr. Dean, which we shall have occasion hereafter to notice. Mr. Murray's ministry continued about twenty-two years, Mr. Streeter's forty years, and the others a little over an average of four years each. Mr. Streeter died, June 2, 1867, at the age of eighty-four years.

During Mr. Mitchell's ministry with the First Church as colleague an act of incorporation, bearing date Feb. 27, 1811, was secured for a Universalist parish in Charlestown. The first meeting was held at the Town Hall, March 14, 1811. The officers chosen were Moses Hall, chairman; Thomas J. Goodwin, clerk; Samuel Thompson, treasurer; Benjamin Adams, collector; who with the following gentlemen constituted the standing committee, — namely, John Kettell, John Tapley, Timothy Thompson, Otis Clapp, Henry Van Voorhis, Isaac Smith, Josiah Harris, Andrew Roulstone, and Barnabas Edmands. The contract for a church edifice previously made by the leading friends of the movement was assumed by the society; and the Rev. Abner Kneeland of Langdon, New Hampshire, was invited to the pastorate, at ten dollars a week, with the rent of a dwelling-house and the expense of removing his family. The dedication took place Sept. 5, 1811, the sermon being given by the Rev. Edward Mitchell, of Boston. In the afternoon of the same day Mr. Kneeland was installed, — the Rev. Hosea Ballou, of Portsmouth, New Hampshire, preaching the sermon, the Rev. Thomas Jones, of Gloucester, "delivering the Scriptures" and giving the charge, and the Rev. Edward Turner, of Salem, extending the fellowship of the churches. The day closed with a social entertainment to the Council and invited guests.

The church had a long line, with rare exceptions, of most worthy men.[1]

[1] The list of pastors is the following: Abner Kneeland, from September, 1811, to January, 1814; Edward Turner, from March, 1814, to March, 1823; —— Winchester, from September, 1824, to March, 1825; Calvin Gardner, from June, 1825, to December, 1826; John Samuel Thompson, from March, 1827, to April, 1828; Linus S. Everett, from November, 1828, to December, 1834; Thomas F. King, from December, 1835, to September, 1839; Edwin H. Chapin, from December, 1840, to November, 1845; Thomas Starr King, from August, 1846, to October, 1848; Robert Townly,



Mr. Kneeland proved unstable in the faith, and soon fell away into Deism and at length into Atheism; Mr. Thompson proved too eccentric for wide usefulness; Messrs. Turner, Gardner, Everett, the elder King, the eloquent Chapin, the brilliant younger King, the quaint Scotchman Laurie, with his faithful successors, were all men of weight, ability, and great usefulness. The church to which they ministered early took high rank among the Universalist churches of the land, and has steadily held it to the present hour. Throughout the seventy years of its history it has numbered many men of high social standing, of large business abilities, of prominent political positions and influence, and of eminence in moral worth and Christian character. With no diminution of religious interest, the church, under the lead of its present able pastor, gives promise of a future as rich in the fruits of the Spirit as has been its honorable past.

Mr. Murray's Universalism, it has already been remarked, was of the Rellyan or Calvinistic type. It differed from pure Calvinism chiefly in making the Atonement universal, and therefore, according to Calvinistic principles, universally effective. Christ was the head of every man, and redemption, though not salvation, was an accomplished fact. Five or six years after his settlement in Boston, an incident occurred which was destined to have a most important influence upon the fortunes of Universalism in general. Mr. Murray made a journey to the South as far as Philadelphia. During his absence the Rev. Hosea Ballou was engaged to supply his pulpit ten Sundays. Mr. Ballou was then a young man under thirty years of age. Born in Richmond, New Hampshire, April 30, 1771, educated or brought up in the Baptist church with which he early united, and led through his great love of spiritual things to an earnest study of the holy Scriptures, he entered into the joy of the Universalist's hope in 1789, when but eighteen years of age. But the philosophy of that hope, as then currently held, was far from being satisfactory to his penetrating mind.[1] Both the doctrine of the Trinity and the then current doctrine of the Atonement soon came under examination, resulting in their rejection by him as early as 1795. He believed that Christ was a special messenger from God, his only begotten Son, and hence subordinate to the Father. His death was not an infliction of penalty due to fallen man, but a voluntary sacrifice of himself in testimony of infinite love, intended to secure an *at-one-ment* between God and man,—a reconciliation of man to God. It is probable that the fanciful views of

from June, 1849, to June, 1852; Alexander G. Laurie, from November, 1853, to July, 1863; Oscar F. Safford, from May, 1865, to July, 1870; William T. Stowe, from May, 1871, to February, 1878; and Charles Follen Lee, the present pastor, was settled Jan. 7, 1879.

[1] Mrs. Murray concedes that at the time of her husband's death his peculiar faith was held only by the Rev. John Tyler, Episcopal minister in Norwich, Conn., and the Rev. Edward Mitchell, of the city of New York. *Life of John Murray*, Introduction, p. xiii.

Mr. Murray in regard to the judgment, in which he followed Relly, were never accepted by Mr. Ballou. He had not as yet, however, come to recognize the continually recurring judgments of God as involved in the current retributions of life, of which at a later period he was fully convinced. He



Hosea Ballou

regarded the whole work of man's salvation as fore-ordained through appropriate means. Believing God to be impartial in his parental love, he was convinced that the decree of human salvation could not be other than universal.

No sooner did his mind become clear upon the subjects of the Trinity and the Atonement, than he hastened openly to avow his new convictions. If there were others sympathizing with these views he was unaware of it, since they made no appeal to the public. In this progress of his mind Mr. Ballou was entirely destitute of human helps, resolving these problems from the Scriptures alone. Meantime, he had been excommunicated from the Baptist church, and ordained to the Universalist ministry.[1] Unsolicited, and without previous notice to Mr. Ballou, at the session of the General Convention in Oxford, 1794, the Rev. Elhanan Winchester, at the conclusion of a sermon of great power and warmth, turned to Mr. Ballou, who was in the pulpit with him, and with a few appropriate remarks thrust the Bible against his breast, saying to the Rev. Joab Young, "Brother Young, charge him." The charge was given, and the ordination was complete.

Such was the young man who in 1798 or 1799 supplied Mr. Murray's desk for ten consecutive weeks. His remarkable familiarity with the Word of God, his wonderful powers of reasoning, his profound insight into the human heart, and his inexhaustible store of illustrations level to the common mind gave him a power over an assembly rarely equalled. He had a large hearing in Boston. The public mind was greatly moved. On the last day of his ministration he gave a very frank and clear explanation of his new views touching Christ and the Atonement. By the suggestion of Mrs. Murray, who was present, one Mr. Balch announced from the gallery that what they had just heard was not the doctrine usually preached in that pulpit; whereupon Mr. Ballou, in great calmness, called upon the audience to take notice of what the brother had said.

The seed thus sown could not but bear fruit. To Mr. Murray, with his Rellyism, Mr. Ballou's doctrines gave great pain. He deemed him to be thinking and speaking with unwarrantable boldness. On the other hand, the people were eager to hear more from a speaker at once so original, so persuasive, so convincing. Overtures were made to him to bring him to Boston; but he could not be induced to take a step which might in any degree result in the injury of Mr. Murray. The wishes of the people, however, were by no means ephemeral. Many things conspired to keep those desires alive. The people were not satisfied with the philosophy of Christianity as commonly presented to them. Mr. Ballou was the most original thinker with whom they had become acquainted. Though far removed from them he was frequently heard from, and always in a way to intensify their desire to have him in their midst. He was a member of the General Convention in 1803 at Winchester, New Hampshire, when the Confession of Faith,[2] drawn by Walter Ferris, was adopted with such marked

[1] Whittemore's *Life of Ballou*, vol. i., *in extenso*.

[2] It consisted of the three following articles:

1. "We believe that the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments contain a revelation of the character of God, and of the duty, interest, and final destination of mankind.

2. "We believe that there is one God, whose nature is love; revealed in one Lord Jesus Christ, by one Holy Spirit of grace, who will finally restore the whole family of mankind to holiness and happiness.

3. "We believe that holiness and true happiness are inseparably connected; and that be-

unanimity. In 1804 his work entitled *Notes on the Parables of the New Testament* was published, and commanded such wide attention as to pass through five or more editions. The first edition was printed at Randolph, Vermont; subsequent ones in Boston.

The work, however, destined to enhance his reputation in a far higher degree as a Christian reasoner and interpreter of Christianity was published the following year, 1805. Like the preceding work it was printed at Randolph, Vermont, — the author being pastor of the united societies of Barnard, Woodstock, Hartland, Bethel, and Bridgewater. It was entitled, *A Treatise on Atonement, in which the Finite Nature of Sin is Argued, its Cause and Consequences as such; the Necessity and Nature of Atonement, and its Glorious Consequences, in the Final Reconciliation of All Men to Holiness and Happiness.* This work was extensively circulated and attentively read in almost every Universalist family in the land. For scores of years after its publication the author continued to receive letters of grateful acknowledgment for the hopes it had begotten of a world's salvation. The work has never been displaced. The views it presents are substantially the views of the Universalist Church to-day, to which also the thought of Christendom seems rapidly tending. Notwithstanding its direct antagonism to the doctrine of Mr. Murray, it was received among Boston Universalists with great favor, and increased the impatience with which they awaited the author's settlement among them.

More than a decade of years must pass, however, before this desire could be fulfilled. At length the way was opened. On Dec. 13, 1816, the Governor signed an act incorporating the Second Society of Universalists in the town of Boston. The first meeting of the Society was held Jan. 25, 1817. From the first it was the purpose of the gentlemen united in this movement to call Mr. Ballou to the pastorate. Having ministered some years in Vermont and in Portsmouth, New Hampshire, he was now at Salem, Massachusetts, with a much-loved parish which had suffered greatly from the general depression in business then experienced. It was understood that, Mr. Murray of the First Church having deceased, Mr. Ballou was not now averse to heeding the wishes of his Boston friends. During the summer of 1817 a meeting-house was erected in School Street, nearly opposite the City Hall, on the site of the present School-Street block.[1] In October of that year it was dedicated, the Rev. Thomas Jones, of Gloucester, preaching the sermon from John iv. 23. Mr. Ballou was absent in Vermont, fulfilling an appointment previously made. The Rev. David Pickering offered the

lievers ought to be careful to maintain order and practise good works; for these things are good and profitable unto men."

[1] This site in part is the precise spot on which the old French church formerly stood, and in the pulpit of which Mr. Murray was stoned in 1774. Built about 1715–20, it was sold to the New Congregational Society, Mr. Croswell pastor, in 1748. On Mr. Croswell's death, in 1785, it is supposed his parish became extinct. In 1788 a Roman Catholic congregation, gathered three or four years before, obtained this house, and worshipped in it until they built the church in Franklin Street, which was dedicated in 1803. The old meeting-house in School Street was then taken down, and the land was subsequently sold to the Second Universalist Society. Whittemore's *Life of Ballou*, ii. 10.

introductory prayer, and the Rev. Edward Turner, of Charlestown, the dedicatory prayer. The Rev. Paul Dean, — at this time the sole pastor of the First Church, — who was supposed not to look with much favor upon this new movement, sat in the desk, but took no part, on account, it was said, of ill health. The unanimous call of the society having been accepted by Mr. Ballou, the installation took place December 25, the same year. The Rev. Paul Dean preached the sermon from Acts xx. 24, and gave the right hand of fellowship. The installing prayer and the charge were by the Rev. Edward Turner; and the Rev. Joshua Flagg, who had succeeded Mr. Ballou at Salem, offered the concluding prayer. These services of dedication and installation revealed a profound interest in the new movement, and showed that high expectation had taken possession of the public mind. Such men as John Brazier, David Townsend, Edmund Wright, Daniel E. Powars, Lemuel Packard, Jr., Levi Melcher, and John Trull, to name no more, were a guarantee of the high character, solid strength, and immediate success of the new society.

The high anticipations from Mr. Ballou's ministry were more than realized. Such had been his peculiar exercise of mind that he had grown accustomed to a much broader field of discussion than was common among his brethren. His advanced positions in Biblical interpretation drew upon him attacks from all quarters, which he repelled with a master hand.[1] His preaching became necessarily controversial. Many of his sermons, singly and in volumes, were published and widely distributed. Letters and pamphlets of attack and reply appeared in rapid succession and through a series of years. Majestic in person, calm in spirit, quick in penetration, and affluent in a broad Christian common-sense, he often surprised his opponents and awakened the keenest interest in his hearers by rending away at a single

[1] His responses were of the keenest sort. An aged lady expressing surprise at his views, added: "The good book says, —

'In Adam's fall we sinned all,'"

to which he replied: "Yes, and the same good book says, —

'The cat doth play, and after slay.'"

On his way of a Saturday evening to a town in Essex County, while waiting for a private conveyance from the railway-station, he stepped into a cottage where he found a good woman washing her floor. She cordially welcomed him, and entered at once into conversation. On learning that her guest was Mr. Ballou, the Universalist preacher, she expressed surprise, and inquired if he "really believed that all men would be saved?" — "Yes, I hope so." — "What!" said she, "is it possible that sinners can be saved *just as they are?*" — "My good woman," said he, "are you going to wash up your floor *just as it is?*" — "Ah!" said she, "I see; I never thought that saving sinners was just making them morally clean."

At a time when Dr. Lyman Beecher was conducting a revival in his church on Bowdoin Street, and much comment had been made in respect to his visiting servant girls in the kitchens, and urging them to his meetings, he met Mr. Ballou, and told him that "he dreamed that he died and went to heaven; and looking carefully about him, he failed to see a single Universalist there." — "I suppose," said Mr. Ballou, "you only went into the kitchen."

On one occasion, being introduced to a venerable lady, she asked: "Are you Mr. Ballou, the Universalist preacher?" On being answered affirmatively, she further inquired: "Do you preach the gospel of the New Testament?" He replied that he "tried to preach it." — "But," said she, "do you preach as the Saviour preached?" — "I try to," was the reply. "Do you preach, 'Woe unto you Scribes, Pharisees, hypocrites'?" — "Ah, no!" said he, "those people do not attend my meeting."

stroke, as it were, the veils of sophistry woven by error, and exposing that error in its own naked deformity.

In 1819 Mr. Henry Bowen, a young man having just published a volume of *Lecture Sermons* from the pen of Mr. Ballou, established the *Universalist Magazine*, with Mr. Ballou as its editor. Within three years of that time the Rev. Thomas Whittemore — a boot-maker's apprentice in State Street when the publication began — became associate editor. Thenceforth Mr. Whittemore continued his editorial labors, amid whatever professional and other burdens resting upon him, throughout his whole life.[1] This *Magazine* was the first Universalist newspaper published in this country, and supposed to be the first in the world. Such was its inspiring influence that in 1824 there had sprung into being no less than a dozen similar newspapers within the limits of New England and the State of New York. At the end of nine years it was transferred to the hands of the Rev. Russell Streeter, of Watertown, and Thomas Whittemore, of Cambridgeport, and continued under the title of *The Trumpet and Universalist Magazine.*



Among the numerous controversies into which Mr. Ballou was drawn, those pertaining to the doctrine of future punishment were conspicuous. While not at this time denying that doctrine, he had come to believe that the Scriptures do not teach it. The full light of eternity, he believed, would banish all love of sinning and win all souls to God, thus saving them, not *in* their sins, but *from* their sins.[2] The secret opposition which the pastor of the First Church — the Rev. Paul Dean — felt to the Second-Church movement became open and avowed in connection with this subject. The

[1] Though Mr. Whittemore, afterward Dr. Whittemore, was never the pastor of a church in Boston, he rendered the cause in the city and throughout the country most eminent service both as a preacher and as an editor and author. His works, among which may be mentioned his *Notes on the Parables*, *Plain Guide to Universalism*, *Life of Hosea Ballou* in four volumes, *Modern History of Universalism*, *Commentary on the Revelation*, etc., were all written in a popular style, and exerted a wide influence. A man of large administrative ability, democratic in feeling and genial in spirit, he was emphatically a man of the people. He died in Cambridge, March 21, 1861, aged sixty-one years.

[2] Few men have been the subjects of such bitter calumny as Mr. Ballou. The doctrines of "death and glory," "salvation in sin," "God looking upon saint and sinner with equal approbation," and the like were almost universally imputed to him by the pulpits of his and even later time. The truth is, Mr. Ballou believed this to be the only world of temptation and of transgression; that God here, by outward and inward laws, by means visible and invisible, justly and adequately recompenses both the evil and the good; that peace can be found only in righteousness, and that when God shall appear men will become like him, for they will see him as he is. Thus those who leave this world unpurified will be saved by moral means as really as those who are saved in the flesh, — exposing him, therefore, no more to the stigma of teaching "death and glory" than does the welcoming of the penitent murderer from the scaffold to heaven expose the teachers who assailed Mr. Ballou to the same stigma. He believed firmly in historic Christianity, in the subordination of Christ to the Father, in the manifestation of the Father's universal love through Christ, in the miracles he wrought, and in the ultimate efficiency of his mission in the salvation of all souls. And these are the views of the Universalist Church to this day.

controversy was long and bitter. The sympathies of the Universalist public were largely with Mr. Ballou. The First Church shared this feeling.

Mr. Dean, having withdrawn from it, April 6, 1823, became pastor of a Third Universalist Church, which was located in Bulfinch Street, whither a portion of the First Society followed him. The dedication of the meeting-house and the installation of the pastor occurred on the same day, — May 7, 1823. Several brethren, among whom Mr. Dean held a conspicuous place, put forth an "appeal" and "declaration," protesting publicly against the views of Mr. Ballou, who, in conjunction with Hosea Ballou, 2d (his grand-nephew), and Thomas Whittemore, made a most effective reply. Mr. Dean, at his own request, was dismissed from fellowship with the Universalist body. Several of the gentlemen felt the force of the reply, and were reconciled. A year later, in 1824, Mr. Dean earnestly sought to be again received into fellowship. Some brethren strongly opposed thereto were persuaded by Mr. Ballou to accede to the request. They yielded with reluctance, and the sequel justified their hesitation. The restorationist schism continued for some years, but the influence of Mr. Ballou remained unimpaired. It was quite otherwise with Mr. Dean. After the lapse of a few years the Rev. Frederick T. Gray, Unitarian, was called to the associate pastorate of the Bulfinch-Street Church, from which Mr. Dean, for a consideration, a little later retired, and the church ceased to be even nominally Universalist.[1]



[1] "During the heat of the controversy between Mr. Ballou and Mr. Dean many interesting incidents took place. Returning on one occasion from Nantucket, where he had spent some days, on reaching New Bedford Mr. Ballou found himself in the stage-coach beside a stranger, who introduced conversation with him. 'Are you from Nantucket, sir?' — 'I am,' replied Mr. Ballou. — 'Is there any news at the island?' — 'I heard none,' said Mr. Ballou. 'There might be much news and I not hear of it.' — 'Ah! well, they say old Ballou is down there preaching; did you hear anything about him?' — 'He has been preaching there, sir.' — 'Large congregations, I suppose; did you hear him, sir?' — 'I did, several times.' — 'Well, I don't like him; he 's coarse in his preaching; he don't believe in any future punishment; he holds that all men will go to heaven when they die, just as they leave this world; I don't like him. There 's Mr. Dean, — I think he's a very fine man, a gentleman; I should like to hear him preach.' — 'Did you ever hear Mr. Ballou preach?' said Mr. Ballou, very calmly. — 'No! no, sir, I never heard him preach; I have no desire to hear him preach; but I should be gratified at an opportunity to hear Mr. Dean. Did you ever hear Mr. Dean, sir?' — 'Yes, sir, several times.' — 'Well, he 's a fine man, sir, — a gentleman; but Ballou I do not like at all; he preaches a horrid doctrine.' — 'And what does he preach, sir, that is horrid?' — 'Oh, he holds that all men will go to heaven at once when they die.' — 'Well, sir, suppose they do; is that *horrid?* Is it not very desirable that all men shall become holy and happy?' — 'Ah, sir, but he holds that men will go to heaven *in their sins.*' — 'But, sir, you have confessed that you never heard him preach; how do you know he preaches in that manner?' — 'Oh, I have heard so, a thousand times.' — 'But you may have been misinformed, my friend. I am quite confident Mr. Ballou holds no such doctrine. If you were to put the question to him, I think he himself would say he held no such doctrine.' — 'I am surprised. Well, what does he hold to, then?' — 'I think if he were *here*, he would say he did not believe what you have attributed to him, — that men are to go to heaven *in their sins*. . . . He probably would say he held that men are to be saved *from* their sins.' — 'Well, you seem to know. Will you let me ask where you live?' — 'I live in Boston, sir.' — 'Do you attend a Universalist church?' — 'I do, sir.' — 'What church do you attend, sir?' — 'I attend Mr. Ballou's, sir.' — 'Are you intimately acquainted with Mr. Ballou, sir.' — 'My name is Hosea Ballou, my friend.' The stranger's confusion may be better imagined than described." — Whittemore's *Life of Ballou*, ii. 247, 248.

A powerful impulse was given to the cause of Universalism during the controversies above referred to by the writings of the Rev. Walter Balfour, a man of remarkable originality and power. Before leaving Scotland, his native country, he became acquainted with the late Rev. John Codman, D.D., long pastor of a church in Dorchester. Reaching New York in 1806, proceeding thence to Albany in company with the late Rev. Daniel Sharp, D.D., whose life-long friendship he enjoyed, he settled in Charlestown in 1807. As a member of the school-board in 1825 he advocated the establishment of an English High and Latin school. The measure failed, as did also the attempt to secure his re-election. Twenty-two years later the suggestion was acted upon, and the school established.[1] In connection with the Rev. Dr. Morse, whose pulpit he often supplied, he organized the first Bible-class established in Charlestown. In 1808 he was appointed to the chaplaincy of the prison, which position he conscientiously resigned on account of his change of views touching infant baptism.[2] Converted to Universalism by Professor Stuart's argument for the universal worship of Christ, Mr. Balfour, in 1824, published his *Inquiry into the Scriptural Import of the Words Sheol, Hades, Tartarus, and Gehenna: all translated "Hell" in the Common English Version.* In 1826 appeared his *Second Inquiry*, designed to show that the terms "Satan," "Devil," etc., were not used in the Bible to designate a specific being. These volumes were followed in 1828 by Balfour's *Essays;* in 1834, by Balfour's *Reply to the Rev. Bernard Whitman;* and in the same year by Ballou's *Examination of the Doctrine of Future Retribution.* Notwithstanding these works were not wholly accordant with each other in doctrine, they were most important contributions to the elucidation of Christian truth, and exerted a very wide influence.

While preachers of the gospel were multiplied, and one work after another was sent forth from the press, the School-Street Church continued to be the Mecca of the Universalist Zion. Mr. Ballou was listened to by visitors and business men from all parts of the country, and the seeds of truth were thus scattered far and wide. The men who started with him in the Christian race were falling under the weight of years; but those who still survived were noble specimens of Christian manhood.

When at length it became necessary to select a colleague for Mr. Ballou, new dangers opened in the pathway of the society. Two candidates, the Revs. T. C. Adam and H. B. Soule, were heard for several months each, neither of whom received the requisite two-thirds vote of the parish. On his retirement from the candidacy, one of them, the Rev. T. C. Adam, followed by a portion of the society, opened meetings in a chapel in Chardon Street. So apparent was his unworthiness that he soon withdrew. Having organized a society and enjoyed the brief ministrations of several clergy-

[1] Letter of his son, D. M. Balfour. [2] *Mass. State Prison*, by Gideon Haynes, p. 10.

men, the chief supporters abandoned the movement, many of them returning to the School-Street Church, and the enterprise soon failed altogether. Finally the School-Street parish called the Rev. E. H. Chapin, D.D., of Charlestown, to the associate pastorate. The installation took place Jan. 28, 1846, Mr. Ballou preaching the sermon. After two years of marked prosperity under the ministrations of this eloquent divine, the parish very reluctantly accepted his resignation, and he removed to New York city. He was immediately succeeded by the Rev. A. A. Miner, of Lowell, both gentlemen entering on their new pastorates May 1, 1848. Mr. Miner was installed May 31, Dr. Chapin preaching the sermon, and Mr. Ballou offering the installing prayer.

The relations of both of these juniors with their senior were marked by the most affectionate cordiality and profound respect.[1] On the death of Mr. Ballou, — which occurred June 7, 1852, — Mr. Miner became sole pastor, which relation he still holds. The office of President of Tufts College having become vacant by the death of Hosea Ballou, 2d, D.D., May 27, 1861, Mr. Miner was elected his successor, it being understood that his pastorate would not be relinquished, though his parish generously excused him from most of the pastoral labor. His inaugural address was delivered July 9, 1862. During the twelve and a half years of his Presidency more than seven hundred thousand dollars were added to the funds of the College, mostly by Boston men, and more than half of it by members of his parish. Jan. 2, 1867, the Rev. Rowland Connor was installed as colleague pastor, Dr. Miner preaching the sermon. Mr. Connor held that office about five months. Dismissed because of his rejection of the authority of Christ, he had quite a following to Mechanics Hall, where he soon conspicuously failed, most of his adherents returning to the parish. June 3, 1868, the Rev. Henry I. Cushman was installed as colleague, Dr. Miner again preaching the sermon. During the nearly seven years of his most faithful service Mr. Cushman won for himself the marked esteem both of his senior and of the society. In 1851 the parish remodelled its church in School Street, at a cost of about twenty thousand dollars; and in 1872 there was erected in its place, for business purposes, a building now known as the School-Street Block, the fee of which, after several changes in the circumstances of the tenure, is in the parish. Its fine new stone church on Columbus Avenue, corner of Clarendon Street, was built the same season, at a cost of about one hundred and fifty thousand dollars, and dedicated Dec. 5, 1872, the

[1] Since the above text was written, Dr. Chapin has closed his earthly labors, terminating one of the two senior Universalist pastorates. He died in New York, Dec. 26, 1880. His funeral was a remarkable occasion. Denominational barriers were utterly broken down. Drs. Pullman and Capen, Universalists, the Rev. Robert Collyer, Unitarian, the Rev. Henry Ward Beecher, Congregationalist, and the Rev. Dr. Armitage, Baptist, joined in paying the highest honors to his memory. In the Columbus-Avenue Universalist Church, Boston, memorial services were held on Sunday, January 9, in the presence of an immense throng, in which the Rev. Messrs. Safford and Lee, Drs. Sawyer, Adams, and Miner, the Governor of the Commonwealth, John D. Long, and the Mayor of the city, F. O. Prince, bore most affectionate testimony to Dr. Chapin's Christian character, matchless eloquence, and ministerial fidelity.

dedicatory address being delivered by Dr. Miner, and the prayer being offered by Mr. Cushman.

The first Universalist sermon preached in Roxbury was by the Rev Elhanan Winchester, in 1798, in the parish church, by invitation of the pastor. Nov. 29, 1818, the Rev. Hosea Ballou preached in the Town Hall.

COLUMBUS-AVENUE CHURCH.

The first Universalist society in Roxbury was organized March 2, 1820. Forty-three men good and true petitioned for the charter. Samuel Parker was chosen moderator of the first meeting, and Luther Newell clerk. The spacious and imposing edifice in which the society still worships was erected on a portion of the Dudley estate, and on the precise site of the mansion

occupied by the Governors Dudley. The old family well in the cellar still remains. This site, costing one thousand dollars, is said now to be worth one hundred thousand dollars. Messrs. William Hannaford, Edward Turner, Lewis Morse, Jacob Allen, Warren Marsh, Joseph Stratton, and Elisha Wheeler were chosen a committee, May 15, and charged with the responsibility of building. September 14, a parish meeting urged the committee to finish the house as soon as possible. It was dedicated Jan. 4, 1821, the Rev. Hosea Ballou preaching the sermon.[1] The Rev. Hosea Ballou, 2d, was the first pastor, and was installed July 26, 1821, the Rev. Paul Dean preaching the sermon, and Mr. Ballou, of Boston, giving the charge. The present pastor, speaking of the first incumbent, says: "For the solidity, the spirituality, the even prosperity of this parish through all these years we are largely indebted to his eminently careful, faithful, and judicious leadership in the beginning of its history."[2] On Jan. 4, 1822, a church, consisting of twenty-two most worthy members, was publicly recognized. Mr. Ballou resigned the pastorate April 28, 1838; and at the semi-centennial anniversary of the church all the original twenty-two members, as also its pastor, had "entered into the promised inheritance." There have been few if any men in the Universalist ministry in Boston or elsewhere, throughout the entire history of the church, who for solid learning, moral and Christian worth, great personal weight, and permanent influence in moulding our whole body into fair proportions, and stimulating it to an increased activity in the cause of education, are worthy of higher honor or deeper gratitude than is the Rev. Hosea Ballou, 2d, D.D. Most fitting was it that the closing years of his useful life should be spent in the duties of the Presidency of Tufts College, in which office he died May 27, 1861, aged sixty-four years.[3]

The Universalist Society of South Boston is the fifth of the churches organized in that part of the city. The population in 1830 was barely three thousand. The access from Boston proper was extremely unpleasant. The Federal-Street bridge had been built two years before. On the last of April, 1830, Elijah Harris, Joseph Harris, Jr., Dr. Ebenezer Stevens, Samuel Burnham, William Andrews, and Isaiah Josselyn (who alone survives) met at the house of one Mr. Holmes, corner of Fourth Street and Dorchester

[1] *Semi-Centennial Memorial*, p. 8.

[2] Ibid., p. 14.

[3] The pastorate of the Roxbury parish has been filled by other most worthy men in the following order: The Rev. Asher Moore, from January, 1839, to January, 1840; the Rev. Cyrus H. Fay, from January, 1841, to March, 1849; the Rev. William H. Ryder, from 1849, to January, 1859; the Rev. J. G. Bartholomew, from July, 1860, to January, 1866; and the Rev. A. J. Patterson, from September, 1866, to the present time. Through all these years the parish has enjoyed uninterrupted prosperity, and vindicated its Christian aims by large sacrifices both in its own immediate field of labor and in the interests of the general Church. The clergymen who have led in this work, several of whom have also won laurels in other fields, will ever be cherished in affectionate remembrance.



Avenue, and associated themselves as the Fourth Universalist Society of Boston.[1] The Rev. Benjamin Whittemore, of Troy, New York, son-in-law of the Rev. Hosea Ballou, and a young man of great promise, who in later years became a Doctor of Divinity, and who still survives in a ripe old age, preached in a hall opposite Mr. Holmes's house. May 9, 1830, having accepted an invitation to become pastor of the new society, he entered upon the duties of that office July 18 of the same year. On May 30, 1831, an accession to the parish was received of fifty-one men, of whom two only now survive.[2] Worship was continued in Harding's Hall until the completion of the church edifice on Broadway, corner of B Street, which was dedicated April 10, 1833, the Rev. Hosea Ballou preaching the sermon, and the pastor offering the dedicatory prayer. The long-deferred installation of the pastor took place on the afternoon of the same day, — the Revs. Thomas Whittemore, Hosea Ballou, Hosea Ballou, 2d, Sebastian Streeter, Matthew Hale Smith, and Lucius R. Paige,[3] rendering the various services. After thirteen years of most faithful and efficient ministration, the able and much-loved pastor, in April, 1843, resigned his pastorate, and was succeeded the following autumn by the Rev. T. D. Cook. During his pastorate several thousands of dollars were expended in alterations in the meeting-house to gain suitable accommodations for the Sunday School, which has ever been an important auxiliary of the church.[4]





The Fifth Universalist Society, now Shawmut, was organized Jan. 10, 1836, and has been among the most influential in the city. The Rev. Otis A Skinner, a man of pure life, of marked ability, fine presence, and peculiar suavity of manner, was installed as pastor Jan. 26, 1837, and resigned May 1, 1846. The Rev. J. S. Dennis was pastor from January, 1847, to August, 1848, when Mr. Skinner served a second term, from January, 1849, to April,

[1] *The Christian Leader*, July 15, 1880.

[2] *Semi-Centennial Discourse*, by the Rev. J. J. Lewis.

[3] The Rev. Lucius R. Paige, D.D., has rendered great service to the Universalist Church both as a preacher and author. His *Selections from Eminent Commentators*, 1833, and his *Commentary* on the entire New Testament, except the Revelation of St. John, of which the first volume was published in 1849, are especially valuable. He has also become widely known by his *History of Cambridge*, and by the conspicuous positions he has most worthily filled.

[4] Mr. Cook, having resigned in 1851, was succeeded by the Rev. Calvin Damon, who ministered till 1855. The Rev. W. W. Dean was pastor from 1855 to 1860; the Rev. J. S. Cantwell, from 1860 to 1862; the Rev. I. C. Knowlton, from 1863 to 1865; when, after an interim of two years, the present pastor, the Rev. J. J. Lewis, took up the work in September, 1867. Meantime, the outbreak of our civil war had disturbed the harmony of the parish, leading to the abandonment of the church in 1864 for Lyceum Hall, which was occupied till the dedication of the present beautiful and commodious church on the heights of Broadway about 1870. To the sterling character of the entire line of pastors must in no small measure be attributed the unexampled self-sacrifice, considering its quite limited resources, through which the parish two or three years ago removed its entire debt of nearly $20,000, giving it a better outlook than it has ever before enjoyed.

1857. During this period he rendered our general church the very great service of raising the funds — about one hundred thousand dollars, including a land gift — for the founding of Tufts College, named from Mr. Charles Tufts, the donor of the land. Mr. Skinner died in Illinois, Sept. 18, 1861. The Rev. T. B. Thayer, D.D., was installed pastor, Dec. 2, 1857, the Rev. Dr. Chapin, of New York city, preaching the sermon. The parish was first free of debt, March 5, 1860.[1]



In April, 1863, the Church of the Paternity united with the Fifth Society, with which its relations had always been cordial, forming the Shawmut Universalist Society. During the first two or three years of its history the Fifth Society worshipped in Boylston Hall. Its church edifice on Warren Street, now the Jewish Synagogue on Warrenton Street, was dedicated Jan. 30, 1839, and occupied by the Fifth Society until the union as above, when possession was taken of the Shawmut Church on Shawmut Avenue, near Brookline Street. This church was purchased of the Congregational society, of which the Rev. Dr. Webb is pastor, and was re-dedicated, April 20, 1864.[2]

On Noddle's Island, now East Boston, previous to 1830, there was but a single residence.[3] In 1840, so rapid had been the growth of the island, there was a small Universalist society worshipping in the old bath-house, where Winthrop Block now stands, and enjoying the ministrations of various clergymen. The Rev. Sylvanus Cobb, afterwards Dr. Cobb, was pastor from 1841 to 1844, during which time a house of worship was erected on the corner of Webster and Orleans streets. After two years of unsuccessful ministration by the Rev. Alexander Hitchborn, Mr. Cobb again stepped



[1] Several families from this parish and others living at the South End organized the Canton-Street Society, and worshipped in a chapel on Shawmut Avenue, corner of Canton Street. It was succeeded in the same field by the Church of the Paternity, organized March, 1859, and ministered to by the Rev. E. C. Bolles, afterward made Doctor of Philosophy, from November, 1859, to January, 1861. Its meetings were held in Concord-Street Chapel. Both these efforts were feeble, and commanded but a feeble following.

[2] On the same day the Rev. Sumner Ellis was installed associate pastor, which office he resigned in October, 1865. The sole pastorate again devolved upon the Rev. Dr. Thayer. In consequence of the broken state of his health, resulting from an accident which befel him some years previous, he resigned the pastorate, April 1, 1867, and gave himself more fully to the editorship of *The Universalist Quarterly and General Review*, upon which he had entered in 1864, succeeding the Rev. Hosea Ballou, 2d, D.D., and which he still conducts with marked ability and to universal acceptance. He was succeeded in the charge of the parish by the Rev. J. L. Briggs, from November, 1867, to November, 1876; by the Rev. J. K. Mason, a graduate of Tufts Divinity School, from November, 1876, to June, 1880; and by the Rev. Henry Blanchard, the present pastor, a graduate of Tufts College, who entered upon his duties June 1, 1880.

[3] *Semi-Centennial Discourse*, by the Rev. J. J. Lewis.

forward to rescue the parish from its embarrassment, and ministered to it from 1846 to 1848.[1] Meantime the church was abandoned, and worship held in Ritchie Hall, in Jones's Hall, in the Webster-Street church again, in Reed's Hall, and in Sumner Hall, until the erection of the present commodious edifice, which was dedicated in December, 1866.[2]

The Universalists of Chelsea established public worship in Guild's Hall in 1842, under the leadership of the Rev. A. P. Cleverly. At the end of two years they removed to Gerrish Hall, where they continued from 1844 to 1850. Mr. Cleverly having terminated his ministry in November, 1844, the Rev. Dr. Cobb preached for them about six months. A society was organized April 21, 1845. The Rev. Eben Francis held the office of pastor from April 30, 1845, to July 2, 1848. In December of the same year the Rev. Charles H. Leonard[3] entered upon the pastorate, and filled the office for nearly twenty-one years, resigning in September, 1869.[4]

In 1858 the Rev. Sumner Ellis was employed by the Universalists of Brighton, now Ward Twenty-five, to preach in Union Hall; others were occasionally heard. After two years' ministration a parish was organized Jan. 12, 1860, and a chapel erected, which was dedicated Aug. 7, 1861.[5]

[1] Dr. Cobb, who died Oct. 31, 1866, at sixty-eight years of age, was a man of massive proportions, both physical and intellectual. Founding the *Christian Freeman and Family Visitor*, a religious and reformatory newspaper, in 1839, at Waltham, he removed it to Boston in 1841, and continued both its proprietor and editor until its union with the *Trumpet and Universalist Magazine*, in 1862, under the title of *The Trumpet and Christian Freeman, a Universalist Magazine*. In 1864 the name was changed to *The Universalist*. In 1870 *The Christian Repository*, Montpelier, Vermont, was joined with it; and in 1878, *The Christian Leader*, and the united papers took the latter name.

[2] In 1849 the Rev. Emmons Partridge became pastor, and was followed by the Rev. C. H. Webster, who closed his labors about 1853. The Rev. A. St. John Chambré, afterward Dr. Chambré, filled the pastorate during 1854 and 1855; the Revs. J. S. Barry, author of a *History of Massachusetts*, in three volumes, and J. W. Talbot, till 1860. In 1863 the Rev. C. J. White, a graduate of Tufts College, became pastor, and the parish entered upon that career of prosperity which gave it a new church in 1866, and has continued, with little vicissitude, to the present time. To the great regret of the entire society, Mr. White resigned in December, 1870, and was succeeded by the Rev. G. H. Vibbert from 1871 to 1873; by the Rev. Selden Gilbert, from 1874 to 1878, when began the labors of the present pastor, the Rev. J. G. Adams, D.D. The numbers, resources, and solidity of the parish at present promise a future whose brightness will sharply contrast with the adversities of its earlier years.

[3] Mr. Leonard was elected in 1869 Goddard Professor of Homiletics and Pastoral Theology in Tufts Divinity School, which office he still holds.

[4] These were years of great prosperity for the parish. It proceeded at once to the erection of a church on Chestnut Street, which was dedicated May 15, 1850; and such was the rapid growth of the parish, that this church was replaced by a larger and more commodious one on the same site, which was dedicated July 10, 1862. The Rev. William G. Tousey, B.D.,* was pastor from April, 1870, to July, 1871; and the Rev. I. M. Atwood,† from April, 1872, to November of the same year. The present pastor, the Rev. A. J. Canfield, was settled May 1, 1873, and is listened to regularly by large audiences.

[5] The Rev. James Eastwood was pastor from July, 1861, to July, 1864; the Rev. T. W. Silloway, from July, 1864, to July, 1867; the Rev. J. W. Keyes, from May, 1868, to September, 1869; the Revs. J. Edgar Johnson and W. A. Start, a few months each; the Rev. J. V. Wilson, from April, 1872, to April, 1874; the Rev. J. G. Adams, D.D., from October, 1876, to August, 1878. The present pastor, the Rev. B. F. Eaton, began his ministry with the parish October, 1878.

* Mr. Tousey, in 1871, was called to the Professorship of Psychology and Natural Theology in Tufts Divinity School.

† Mr. Atwood, in 1879, succeeded the late Rev. Ebenezer Fisher, D.D., as the head of the Divinity School connected with the St. Lawrence University, and subsequently received the degree of Doctor of Divinity.

The Universalist Society of Jamaica Plain, now Ward Twenty-three, was organized May 18, 1871. Its meeting-house, situated on Centre Street, corner of Greenough Avenue, was purchased of the Congregational Society the same month.[1]

The Grove Hall Universalist Parish was organized June 23, 1877. It was not a branch of, or off-shoot from, any other church, but an independent movement growing out of a Sunday-school organized about a year earlier under the direction of the Boston Sunday-School Union. In the summer of 1877 a church was erected which, including the site, cost ten thousand dollars. It was dedicated the following December.[2]

The Dorchester Universalist parish, known as St. John's Church, was the outgrowth of occasional preaching in Lyceum Hall on Meeting-house Hill, and in the Old High-School house. Professor C. H. Leonard began ministering in the latter place February, 1874. The parish was organized when possession was taken of the new chapel, Sept. 12, 1875, and Professor Leonard continued its non-resident pastor till February, 1880 The present pastor, the Rev. J. H. Weeks, a graduate both of Tufts College and Divinity School, entered upon his work Feb. 8 of the same year.

It will be seen that the movement of the business centres during the hundred years of the history of the Universalist Church, the mobility of the population, and the necessarily empirical character of many of the efforts incident to the founding of a new body of Christians have been the occasion of many vicissitudes. But it is gratifying to note that the number of parishes in Suffolk County, greater than at any former period, and strengthened by the usual auxiliaries of Christian work, the cost and commodiousness of the church edifices, the number, devotedness, and resources of the worshippers, and their increasing interest in the cause of education and of church extension are so many pledges of a future position and influence of the Universalist body in a high degree gratifying.

To the agencies thus far noticed must be added the Universalist Publishing-house, formerly located at 37 Cornhill, now at 16 Bromfield Street, Boston. The several publishing interests, thitherto in private hands, were purchased by a few devoted friends of the Church in 1862, and the profits thenceforward consecrated to the general up-building of the Universalist cause. Success attending the enterprise, an act of incorporation was secured in May, 1872. Its capital at the present time is forty-five thousand dollars,

[1] Public worship had been held for about six months in James's Hall, conducted by various clergymen under the auspices of the Massachusetts Convention. Professor Charles H. Leonard supplied the desk for about two years. The Rev. William H. Dearborn was settled as pastor in November, 1873, and ministered till November, 1875. For about three and a half years the pulpit was supplied mostly by the Rev. B. K. Russ. The present pastor, the Rev. B. F. Eaton, took up the work, in connection with that of the Brighton parish, May 1, 1879.

[2] The pulpit was supplied for several months by the Rev. Dr. Thayer. In May, 1878, the Rev. F. A. Dillingham, then a student in the Divinity School connected with Tufts College, accepted a unanimous invitation to the pastorate, and was ordained and installed August 29, 1878, closing his labors April 1, 1881. All the departments of the parish and church are healthy and harmonious; and as the neighborhood is growing rapidly in population, and families of various antecedents heartily unite in the movement, the future is hopeful.

including sixteen thousand dollars of trust funds, the income of which is devoted to the reducing of the price of its publications for wider circulation. Among its issues are *The Christian Leader*, *The Myrtle*, *The Universalist Quarterly*, *Sunday-School Helper*, and *Universalist Register*. Besides these periodicals, it has owned the stereotype plates of one hundred and forty volumes, many of which are still in constant demand. Among them, besides those already mentioned in this chapter, are the following valuable works: The *Crown of Thorns; Discourses on the Lord's Prayer; Hours of Communion*, — by the Rev. E. H. Chapin, D.D. *Ancient History of Universalism; Counsel and Encouragement*, — by the Rev. Hosea Ballou, 2d, D.D. *Modern History of Universalism; Notes and Illustrations on the Parables of the New Testament; Life of Rev. Hosea Ballou; Commentary on the Revelation of St. John*, — by the Rev. Thomas Whittemore, D.D. *A Compend of Christian Divinity; The New Testament of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, with notes, etc.*, — by the Rev. Sylvanus Cobb, D.D. *Theology of Universalism; Over the River, or Pleasant Walks into the Valley of Shadows and Beyond; Origin and History of the Doctrine of Endless Punishment*, — by the Rev. T. B. Thayer, D.D. *Endless Punishment*, in the very words of its advocates, by the Rev. Thomas J. Sawyer, D.D., Packard Professor of Theology in Tufts Divinity School. *The Universalism of the Lord's Prayer; Memoir of the Rev. Thomas Whittemore, D.D.; Practical Hints to Universalists*, — by the Rev. John G. Adams, D.D. *The Old Forts Taken*, by the Rev. A. A. Miner, D.D. *The Latest Word of Universalism*, being thirteen essays by thirteen clergymen; *Memoir of the Rev. Ebenezer Fisher, D.D.*, President of the Theological School connected with the St. Lawrence University, Canton, New York, — by the Rev. George H. Emerson, D.D., editor of the *Christian Leader*. *Illustrations of the Divine Government*, by T. Southwood Smith, M.D. *The Philosophy of Universalism; Exposition and Defence of Universalism; Sermons for the Times and People; The Doctrine of Endless Misery Examined and Refuted; Rudiments of Theological and Moral Science*, — by the Rev. I. D. Williamson, D.D. *At Our Best*, by the Rev. Sumner Ellis, D.D. *Our New Departure; Universalism in Life and Doctrine*, — by the Rev. Elbridge Gerry Brooks, D.D. *The Christian Doctrine of Salvation*, by the Rev. Ebenezer Fisher, D.D. *Ely and Thomas's Discussion* (a series of letters between the Rev. Styles Ely, D.D., and the Rev. Abel C. Thomas); *Letters on the Moral and Religious Duties of Parents*, — by the Rev. Otis A. Skinner, D.D. *The Balance, or Moral Arguments for Universalism*, by the Rev. A. D. Mayo; and *The Antiquity of Man*, by the Rev. J. P. Maclean. To these must be added *Memoirs* of the Rev. Henry Bacon and of the Rev. Sylvanus Cobb, D.D., with an autobiography of the first forty-one years of the life of the latter; various hymn-books and liturgies, as well as juvenile publications and Sunday-school text-books and books for Sunday-school libraries.

The general interests of the Universalist Church have been greatly advanced also by numerous publications from other sources. Some of the

more important of these are: *Heaven our Home*, by the Rev. G. W. Quimby, D.D., editor of the *Gospel Banner*, Augusta, Maine. *A Cloud of Witnesses; Bible Threatenings; Aion-Aionios; Bible Proofs of Universal Salvation; The Bible Hell*, — by the Rev. J. W. Hanson, D.D., editor of the *Star and Covenant*, Chicago, Ill. *A Century of Universalism*, by the Rev. Abel C. Thomas; and the *Biblical Review*, a new and improved commentary on the Bible, in a form for reading as well as for reference, by the Rev. W. E. Manley, D.D. A glance at this list shows that the practical obligations of Christianity have been by no means overlooked.

Among the publishers of Universalist literature in Boston who preceded the establishment of the present publishing-house, besides Mr. Henry Bowen already named, mention should be made of Mr. Bela Marsh, who was engaged in the business half a century ago; Mr. B. B. Muzzey, at 29 Cornhill, who died in 1857; the Rev. Thomas Whittemore, D.D., at 37 Cornhill, who died in 1861, and who was succeeded by the Rev. J. M. Usher; and Mr. Abel Tompkins, at 40 Cornhill, who died about twenty years since. The general business of the present house is annually increasing under the judicious management of the agent, Mr. Charles Caverly.

Such in outline is the history of Universalism in Boston. The first church in the country was organized in Gloucester in 1779; but Boston may justly claim to have been the more immediate centre of influence down to the present time. At the end of the first century now reached Boston contains ten parishes; and what may be called Business Boston, extending twenty miles from the city in all directions, contains more than forty, with a number of others just outside that limit. The nearly eight hundred clergymen in the country, and about one thousand parishes, embracing forty-three thousand families, thirty-eight thousand church members, and fifty-eight thousand members of Sunday-schools, with more than eight hundred church edifices and parish property exceeding $6,250,000 net, are distributed among twenty-three State Conventions, and are all represented in one General Convention, whose funds exceed $135,000. The Woman Centenary Association has raised and expended in missionary work, during the eleven years of its history, more than $100,000. Eleven periodicals are published in the interests of the Church; and the half-dozen academies, four colleges, and two divinity schools possess an aggregate endowment of about $2,000,000.

CHAPTER XIII.

THE NEW JERUSALEM CHURCH IN BOSTON.

BY THE REV. JAMES REED,

Pastor of the First New Jerusalem Church.

"THE Boston Society of the New Jerusalem," established in 1818, was the first organization formed in New England of believers in the doctrines taught by Emanuel Swedenborg. The original number of its members was but twelve, and its growth, for many years after its formation, was far from rapid. In 1828 the names of sixty-three persons had been entered on its rolls. In 1838 this number had swelled to one hundred and eighty-eight; and from that time to the present (1880) the average annual increase has been a little more than twenty-three. Eleven hundred and fifty-nine persons have been received into the society during the sixty-two years of its existence. Many of these have been removed by death, or transferred to other societies of the New Church; so that the present number is not much above six hundred.

From the foregoing statistics it will be seen that this society, judged by the ordinary standards, has had its full measure of prosperity. It may be added that all, or nearly all, the other New-Church societies in Massachusetts — some twenty in number — have been largely recruited from its membership.

The present house of worship in Bowdoin Street, near Beacon Street, was built and occupied in 1845. Prior to this time the meetings of the church were held in halls hired for the purpose. The only other society within the city limits is in Roxbury. It was established in 1870, under the charge of the Rev. Abiel Silver, but lately deceased, assisted by the Rev. D. V. Bowen, and has a handsome and substantial edifice on the corner of St. James and Regent streets. There are also societies in Brookline, Newton, and Waltham.

The first pastor of the Boston Society was the Rev. Thomas Worcester, D.D., a graduate of Harvard College in 1818, and one of the twelve original members of the society, which, as has been said, was instituted the same year. His father was the Rev. Noah Worcester, D.D., a well-known writer and clergyman, and a man of marked ability and influence. Thomas Worcester's interest in the writings of Swedenborg began while he was in

college, and he lost no time in communicating to his friends and classmates a knowledge of the new doctrines. Several of them became members of the society at the time of its formation or afterward, among whom may be mentioned John H. Wilkins, Caleb and Sampson Reed, T. B. Hayward, and Warren Goddard. Many other Harvard graduates, including the brothers Theophilus and William Parsons, have been connected with the church during the course of its existence.

Dr. Worcester was a man of strong and decided character, and took a leading position among those with whom he was associated, not only in his own society, but in the church at large. He also served a term of six years in the Board of Overseers of Harvard College, and received the honorary degree of D.D. from that institution. He died in August, 1878, at the age of eighty-three. His pastoral charge of the church in Boston was terminated in 1867, having embraced a period of almost fifty years. He was succeeded by the Rev. James Reed, a son of his classmate and life-long friend Sampson Reed, and a graduate of Harvard in the year 1855. Mr. Reed is at the present time the pastor of the society. For the last seven years of Dr. Worcester's pastorate he served as his assistant.

So far as is known, attention was first called in Boston to Swedenborg and his writings by one James Glen, in or about the year 1784. He appears to have visited the city for the purpose of lecturing on this subject. Not much is known of the results of his efforts; but it is believed that some interest was awakened, which became more apparent at a later period.

In 1794, and again in 1796, the Rev. William Hill, of England, came to this country with the avowed object of disseminating the doctrines of the New Church. For a considerable time he resided in Massachusetts, in the vicinity of Boston. He is said to have had great hopes of Harvard University, and is known to have presented some of Swedenborg's works to the library. The immediate result of his efforts could hardly have met his expectations, as the number of his converts was very small; but the books which he distributed here and there produced effects more tangible and lasting. Of those deposited in Harvard College library Dr. Worcester tells an amusing story in a communication made by him to the Boston church some years ago. He says: —

"Upon my return to the college, after I had begun to read Swedenborg, I went to the library the second time to see if I could find any of his works. The librarian looked into the catalogue again, and found the alcove and shelves where they ought to have been, but they were not there. Then we began a thorough search. We looked through the whole library, in place and out of place, but could not find them. Then we began to think of other rooms. At that time the library was in the second story of the west end of Harvard Hall. In the east end was a large room called the 'Philosophical Room.' And between this room and the library was a small room, which for the want of a proper name was called the 'Museum.' It was filled with rubbish, old curiosities, cast off, superseded, and obsolete philosophical apparatus, and so forth, all covered with dust. We could see no reason for hunting here, except that

we had hunted everywhere else, without finding what we wanted. There was a long table in the room. Upon it and under it were piles of useless articles, and beyond it were shelves against the wall, where various things were stored away. On the under shelf, as far out of sight as possible, I saw some books. I told the librarian, and he went round and worked his way until he got at them, and found that the large books were volumes of the 'Arcana Coelestia.' There were also several other works of Swedenborg, all of them covered with dust. I immediately got an order from President Kirkland, giving me authority to take the books and keep them in my room; and this I did for the rest of my college life."[1]

The incident here narrated illustrates the estimate which was placed on Swedenborg's writings at that time. Those who embraced the new doctrines and became members of the church did so at the risk of much personal sacrifice. Some of Dr. Worcester's college associates were unable, after their graduation, to obtain positions as teachers on account of their Swedenborgian belief; and others found themselves, for the same reason, almost cut off from their former social connections. Mr. Henry G. Foster, one of the earliest members of the Boston Society, writes in 1857 concerning the state of things at or about the year 1818, that "those who made any efforts to impart the truths they had received were in general soon led to relinquish the attempt by the incredulity or disdain with which they were repelled;" that "they were acknowledged, by the condescending liberality of their contemporaries, to be good people, though weak to a degree little short of fatuity;" and he adds: "The change which has taken place during the last half century is nearly unimaginable to the present generation."[2]

While this last observation of Mr. Foster is undoubtedly true, it must yet be admitted that the growth of the New Church as a visible organization has been slow. Although there is probably no religious body which holds its peculiar tenets with a deeper conviction of their truth and value than those who are known as Swedenborgians, they cannot claim to have received at any time large accessions from the community around them. But they feel nevertheless that the doctrines they profess exert a constant and ever increasing influence on the thought of the age, and contain the vital principles which must finally prevail over the minds of men, whether their own immediate efforts to propagate them meet with success or failure.

These reflections lead me to speak more particularly of the claim which Swedenborg makes, not for himself personally, but for the truth which is revealed in his writings.

All who are familiar with his biography know that he was, in his own day and generation, a distinguished philosopher and scientist, and an influential member of the Swedish Diet. It was not until he was over fifty years of age that he became a writer on spiritual themes. He then believed that he had been called by the Lord to make known to men the internal or spiritual

[1] *Biographical Sketch of Thomas Worcester, D.D.*, by Sampson Reed, pp. 17, 18.
[2] *New Jerusalem Magazine*, vol. xxx. pp. 111, 112.

sense of the divine Word, with the doctrines contained therein, that sense having been first made clear to his own mind as he diligently read the Scriptures. From that time until his death, which took place in 1772, when he was eighty-four years old, he was continually writing and publishing books on theological subjects. Yet he did not intermit his attention to his public duties; nor does he appear to have lost in any degree his general influence.

He declares that the time in which he lived and wrote was that of the close or consummation of the first Christian Church, and was signalized by no less an event than the second coming of the Lord and the establishment of a new era or dispensation of Christianity. Not that the Lord came visibly, in person, to the outward apprehension of men, or that the divine impulse which gave birth to the new age was manifest in this world. But the work was primarily and essentially a spiritual one. According to the philosophy taught by Swedenborg, all natural events are traceable to spiritual causes; and the two worlds, the spiritual and the natural, are closely connected with each other. Hence any important occurrence taking place in the former must sooner or later produce its effects here on earth.

Without going further into particulars, or attempting to argue the question, it is sufficient to say that Swedenborg claimed to foresee, from a spiritual point of view, that after the middle of the last century a marked change would come over humanity. A new impetus would be given to human thought and life. There would be a new heaven and a new earth, in that a new state of things would exist both in heaven and on earth. Not only religion and theology, but all else that deeply affects the lives of men, would undergo a transformation. There would be a new church, or a new dispensation of divine truth and influence in the broadest sense. The change would be gradual, but it would be universal. Not a few who have never heard of Swedenborg, or have heard only to deride him, bear unconscious testimony to the truth of this prediction. That we are living in a wonderful new age is every day becoming more and more the common feeling and belief of mankind. It is declared with ever increasing unanimity and confidence that the Christianity of the future must and will be radically different from the Christianity of the past.

Swedenborg himself says, respecting this new age: —

"The state of the world hereafter will be quite similar to what it has been heretofore; for the great change which has been effected in the spiritual world does not induce any change in the natural world as regards the outward form; so that the affairs of States — peace, treaties, and wars, with all other things which belong to societies of men in general and in particular — will exist in the future just as they existed in the past. The Lord's saying, that in the last times there will be wars, and that nation will then rise against nation, and kingdom against kingdom, and that there will be famines, pestilences, and earthquakes in divers places (Matt. xxiv. 6, 7), does not signify that such things will exist in the natural world; for the Word in its prophecies does not treat of the kingdoms or of the nations upon earth, or consequently of their

wars, or of famines, pestilences, and earthquakes in nature, but of such things as correspond to them in the spiritual world. . . . But as for the state of the church, this it is which will be dissimilar hereafter; it will be similar indeed in the outward form, but dissimilar in the inward. To outward appearance divided churches will exist as heretofore; their doctrines will be taught as heretofore, and the same religions as now will exist among the gentiles. But henceforth the man of the church will be in a freer state of thinking on matters of faith — that is, on spiritual things which relate to heaven — because spiritual liberty has been restored to him."[1]

It will be evident from all these considerations that New Churchmen, or Swedenborgians, must needs take a broad view of the church and its growth. How far the old Christian sects will be dismembered, and the little body which includes the subject of this chapter be blessed with continuous life, and become the acknowledged nucleus of the church of the future, is a matter of comparative indifference to them. The great fact everywhere confronts them, that the prophecies which they have been led to believe are receiving manifest fulfilment; that the establishment of a new church or dispensation is rapidly going on; that fresh light from heaven is descending, and new spiritual influences are busily at work; that liberty of thought is daily increasing, and that in the exercise of it each man sooner or later will find the place that belongs to him. As for themselves, experience shows them that their own sense of spiritual need can be satisfied only in an organization which gives full expression to the specific doctrines taught in Swedenborg's writings. Accordingly they maintain such an organization, endeavoring to be true to their deepest convictions and to enjoy the same spiritual freedom which they willingly concede to others.

Their policy with regard to the religious denominations around them has never been aggressive. Believing, as they do, that human salvation depends on the use which is made of opportunities more than on the opportunities themselves, and that therefore the kingdom of heaven lies open to men of all nations and creeds, they do not feel that kind of solicitude which has often led the members of some Christian sects to compass sea and land in search of proselytes as a matter involving the issues of eternal life and death. Believing also that religious truth cannot really be received by man unless he is in a state of freedom and rationality, they do not approve of any urgent and persuasive methods which tend to hinder the exercise of these two faculties. Their chief reliance, in addition to the maintenance of public worship, has been on the publication and circulation of books, mainly the writings of Swedenborg. One gentleman in Philadelphia, Mr. L. C. Iungerich, has during the last seven years given away, through the publishing house of J. B. Lippincott & Co., many thousand volumes to Protestant clergymen of all denominations; and other individuals and associated bodies have devoted much time and money to the same work.

This chapter does not offer a suitable occasion for speaking in detail of the peculiar doctrines of the New Church. Suffice it to say that they differ

[1] Treatise on *The Last Judgment*, No. 73.

from other doctrines not on any single point or any few points which might be quickly named; but they bring new light to bear on every subject of human thought. Under their influence all things in heaven and earth appear transformed. To those who believe them they come with the certitude of rational conviction. They are seen as philosophical principles, which are no more to be doubted than so many mathematical demonstrations. Instead of being at war with science, they look to science for their proof and confirmation; yet they are equally in harmony with Scripture. I am aware that these assertions will seem to many like the unguarded expressions of mere enthusiasm. But be this as it may, they will at least serve to define the position of a religious body which, undisturbed by the fewness of its numbers and the narrow limits of its nominal influence, yet confidently awaits the issue of events, beholding in the signs of the time the fulfilment of its expectations and hopes, as the advanced guards of human progress constantly draw nearer to its own standard of Christian truth.

James Reed.

CHAPTER XIV.

THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH IN BOSTON.

BY THE VERY REV. WILLIAM BYRNE,

Vicar-General of the Diocese.

ONE hundred years ago there were about one hundred Catholics in Boston. These were for the most part either French, Irish, or Spanish. They had then no church organization, no church, no regular place of worship, and only the occasional ministrations of transient priests. Only two of these are known to have made any considerable stay in Boston. These were the Abbé de la Poterie, an ex-chaplain of the French navy, who said the first mass in the School-Street chapel, Nov. 2, 1788, and the Rev. Louis Rousselet; the latter was here about the close of the War of Independence.

These missionaries were succeeded by the Rev. John Thayer, a native of Boston, a convert to the Catholic faith, who had been a Congregational minister. During this gentleman's travels in Europe in 1781–83 he learned and accepted the doctrines of the Roman Catholic Church. After this change he still felt impelled to continue the work of the Christian ministry, and resolved to become a priest. With this end in view he entered the seminary of St. Sulpice, Paris. There he completed his studies, and prepared himself for the reception of sacred orders. After being ordained priest he returned to America, and visited Dr. Carroll, of Baltimore, the superior of the missions in the United States. Dr. Carroll assigned him to the Boston mission. On his arrival in Boston, Jan. 4, 1790, he found the Catholics using as a place of religious assembly and worship a small chapel on School Street. This chapel had been previously occupied by a small Huguenot congregation,[1] but was the property of Mr. Perkins, from whom Father Thayer obtained, in 1790, a lease for a few years.[2] This may be said to be the first regularly organized church society of Roman Catholics in Boston.[3]



[1] [See Vol. II. p. 253. — Ed.]

[2] From the arrival of the Rev. John de Cheverus in 1796, the Rev. John Thayer devoted his chief attention to the few Catholics who had settled in New England outside of Boston, till he was sent to the Kentucky Missions in 1799. During his stay in Boston, he was frequently engaged in controversies on religious subjects.

[3] The Rev. Dr. Carroll, of Baltimore, superior of the Catholic Missions in the United

On Aug. 20, 1792, the Rev. Francis A. Matignon, a French priest, arrived in Boston, having been sent by Dr. Carroll to assist Father Thayer. Before the French Revolution drove Dr. Matignon from his native land, he had been for several years regius professor of divinity in the College of Navarre. He was a most valuable helper in the work of the Boston mission, as he was a learned ecclesiastic, a zealous priest, a highly educated and polite scholar, and a man of a meek, gentle, and genial disposition.

CATHEDRAL OF THE HOLY CROSS, IN FRANKLIN STREET.

The Rev. John de Cheverus, another exiled French priest, soon, however, joined him on this mission. This he did at Dr. Matignon's invitation and with the sanction of Dr. Carroll. He was ordained at Paris, Dec. 18, 1790, in the last public ordination which preceded the breaking out of the great French Revolution. He arrived in Boston Oct. 3, 1796. Two clergymen better fitted than Matignon and Cheverus for the peculiar needs

States, paid an official visit to the Boston mission during the year 1791. The only record of this visit, so far as we can discover, is found in a letter of Dr. Carroll, dated Aug. 28, 1791, and addressed to Governor Hancock. After most heartily thanking the Governor and his estimable lady for the many favors and civilities they extended to him during his stay in Boston, Dr. Carroll concludes his letter as follows: —

"I know that your Excellency frequently sees Mr. and Mrs. Jaffray, Mr. Sheriff and his sister, the Rev. Mr. Thatcher, and Judge Sullivan. Will it be too much presumption to ask that I may be mentioned to them as full of gratitude for their civilities and politeness, and anxious to give any proof of it that they can command? Desiring once more my very humble respects to your most obliging and polite Lady, I have the honor to be with the utmost esteem,

"Sir, your most obedient and humble servant,

"† J. Carroll."

The original of this letter is in the possession of the Rev. E. H. Welch, S. J. of Boston College, and was presented to him about eighteen years ago by Mr. Charles Hancock.

of the Boston missions could hardly be found. Their virtue, piety, and zeal won the hearts of the Catholics, and, together with their refined manners and genial disposition, soon gained the respect and esteem of the citizens in general.

In a few years after this, the Catholic congregation having somewhat increased in numbers, it was thought well to build a church for their accommodation.[1] A committee to solicit contributions for this object was appointed at a meeting held March 31, 1799. The members of the committee were Hon. Don Juan Stoughton, Spanish consul at this port, John Magner, Michael Burns, John Duggan, Patrick Campbell, Owen Callaghan, and Edmund Connor. The committee in a few weeks secured subscriptions amounting to $3,000. Many pledged themselves to give half their monthly earnings till the church was completed and paid for. A lot of land at the foot of Franklin Street was immediately purchased. A second subscription to create a building fund was then opened. At the head of this subscription list we find the name of John Adams, President of the United States; Dr. Matignon received some contributions from friends in the Southern States. The total sum collected was $16,153, of which $3,433 was contributed by Protestants friendly to the enterprise. Ground was broken for the foundations, March 17, 1800. The church, sixty by eighty feet, was built in accordance with plans furnished by Mr. Charles Bulfinch, architect.[2] It was a brick structure on a stone foundation, the basement walls being also of stone; and it cost about $20,000. On Sept. 29, 1803, it was dedicated to divine worship, under the title of the Holy Cross, by Bishop Carroll, of Baltimore, to whom, jointly with Dr. Matignon, the land was deeded in trust for the Catholics of Boston. He was assisted in the ceremony by Dr. Matignon and the Rev. John de Cheverus and two other priests. A procession starting from the house of the Spanish consul proceeded to the church. After blessing the church in the mode prescribed in the Roman Catholic ritual, the bishop celebrated a solemn high mass; Mr. Mallet presided at the organ. The church was densely crowded, and the assembly out of doors was very large and orderly. Dr. Cheverus preached the dedicatory sermon. A bell brought here from Spain, now in the mortuary chapel of Holyhood Cemetery, was presented to the church by Mr. Hasket Derby.



This church was afterward known as the Franklin-Street Cathedral of the Holy Cross. It was subsequently enlarged, and was for many years the only Catholic church in Boston. Divine service continued to be conducted in it till September, 1860, when it was sold to Isaac Rich, business in the

[1] The Catholics about this time numbered twelve or fifteen hundred.

[2] [A beautiful silver urn, given to Mr. Bulfinch by the Catholics in testimony of his skill and disinterestedness, is still retained in the family of his daughter in New York. A portrait of Mr. Bulfinch, and an estimate of his work as an architect find place in a later chapter. — Ed.]

mean time having so completely transformed the neighborhood that few dwelling-houses remained, and traffic in the vicinity having become so noisy that the usefulness of the church was greatly impaired. It is now replaced by the magnificent Cathedral of the Holy Cross at the South End.

+ John Cheverus R.C. Bishop

In the year 1808 Boston was made an episcopal see by Pope Pius VII. Owing to the troubled state of Europe at that time the official papers appointing Dr. Cheverus first Bishop of Boston did not arrive till 1810. The new diocese, of which Boston was thus made the centre, embraced all the New-England States. Bishop Cheverus was consecrated in Baltimore, Nov. 1, 1810, by Bishop Carroll.

[1] [This cut follows a likeness painted by Gilbert Stuart just before the Bishop left Boston, and is now owned by Mrs. Horatio Greenough, of Boston. It was painted for Mrs. John Gore. See Mason's *Gilbert Stuart*, p. 158 — Ed.]

On Sept. 19, 1818, Dr. Matignon died in Boston. His remains were deposited in the tomb of John Magner in the Old Granary Burying-ground

à me Francisco Antonio Matignon Miss.° Apost.°

on Tremont Street, where they remained till transferred, shortly afterward, to the new Catholic cemetery in South Boston. They now lie under the floor of the mortuary chapel of St. Augustine in that cemetery.

The Ursuline Convent was established in a building beside the cathedral, June 16, 1820, and a school for girls was opened and taught by the nuns. The project of a nunnery and school was first broached by the Rev. John Thayer. Such interest did he take in the matter that he collected about $8,000 for this purpose; and when he died, in 1822, in Limerick, Ireland, he was engaged in soliciting funds for this object. The Ursulines were afterward, in 1826, transferred by Bishop Fenwick to a convent built for them in Charlestown, on a hill since known as Mount Benedict, now in the city of Somerville.

To the great regret of all classes of citizens, Bishop Cheverus, failing in health, was recalled to his native country, and left for France Oct. 1, 1823. There he was made Bishop of Montauban, and was afterward transferred to Bordeaux, where he died cardinal archbishop, July 19, 1836. Very Rev. William Taylor, vicar-general, administered the affairs of the diocese till the appointment of the second bishop of Boston, Benedict J. Fenwick,[1] a native of Maryland, and a member of the Society of Jesus, who was consecrated in Baltimore by Bishop Marechal, Nov. 1, 1825. When he came to Boston, accompanied by Bishop England, he found only two priests in the city, — the Rev. William Taylor, V. G., and the Rev. Patrick Byrne.

P Byrne

The Rev. James Fitton and the Rev. William Wiley were ordained priests in December, 1827. The first Catholic school for boys was opened in connection with the cathedral in 1827, and was taught by the ecclesiastical students who were pursuing their studies under the direction of Bishop Fenwick. It was in this school that the present Archbishop of Boston received his first lessons in the rudiments of Latin. Rev. James Fitton, still living, was one of his teachers.

Bishop Fenwick, finding that there were little colonies of Catholics settled in Charlestown and at Cragie's Point, resolved to build a church for them. Aug. 15, 1828, he visited and approved a site for a new church midway between these points. At his suggestion a meeting of the Catholics of these districts was held August 25 of that year, at which a plan of building and paying for a church with one hundred and twenty pews was adopted.

[1] Bishop Fenwick was born, Sept. 3, 1782, in St. Mary's County, Maryland. He belonged to one of the first families that came from England to settle in Maryland, under Lord Baltimore's Charter. He was also among the first to join the Society of Jesus on its revival.

By selling half the pews it was found that about $6,000 could be secured. A lot of land was purchased from Amos Binney for $1,569, and the church begun Oct. 3, 1828, when the corner-stone was laid by Bishop Fenwick, assisted by the Rev. P. Byrne, Father Wiley, and the Rev. William Tyler, of Boston, the Rev. John Mahony, of Salem, and the Rev. R. D. Woodley, of Providence. A procession led by the cross-bearer proceeded from the house of Mr. Robertson, a Protestant gentleman, to the site of the church on Richmond Street. Bishop Fenwick blessed the foundation and laid the corner-stone with the usual ceremonies. He also preached the sermon. An immense assembly of people was present, many of whom were drawn there by curiosity to witness this novel spectacle. On May 10, 1829, the church being finished, it was dedicated under the title of St. Mary's. Bishop Fenwick performed the ceremony, assisted by the Rev. James Fitton and the Rev. William Wiley, and also preached. The mass was celebrated by the Rev. William Tyler, who was afterward first bishop of Hartford, assisted by Fathers Fitton and Wiley, — this being his first solemn high mass. The concourse of Catholics and others was very great. Father Fitton preached a sermon at vespers.[1]



The small mortuary chapel standing since 1819 in St Augustine's Cemetery in South Boston was enlarged so as to be used as a church in 1831 for the accommodation of the few Catholic settlers of that peninsula. The Rev. Mr. O'Flaherty said the first mass in the enlarged chapel, and preached a sermon on the occasion. Afterward this church was attended by the Rev. Thomas Lynch and the Rev. John Mahony.

This year the *United States Intelligencer* was published in Boston as the successor of a newspaper called the *Jesuit*, which was begun in 1829. The articles in these papers were chiefly controversial, and their tone polemic rather than apologetic. They were dictated by sincere conviction and zeal rather than by policy or expediency; and while they may have made some converts and enlightened not a few, they must have been distasteful, not to say irritating, to many.

The Sisters of Charity were first introduced into Boston in 1832. They came from St. Joseph's, Emmettsburg, Maryland. Sister Ann Alexis was their first superior in this city, and their duties were to take care of orphans and poor children. The labors of Sister Ann Alexis, extending over a period of nearly fifty years, were productive of great good, and were highly appreciated by citizens of every religious belief. The female orphan asylum on Camden Street is a fitting monument of her charity, zeal, and industry.[2]

[1] In 1830, just fifty years ago, the entire Catholic population of Boston and Charlestown was about ten thousand souls, attended by the bishop and four priests, — namely, O'Flaherty, Wiley, Tyler, and Byrne. The baptisms in that year numbered five hundred and twenty-six.

[2] They first opened a school for girls on Hamilton Street. They opened an orphan asylum on the corner of High and Pearl streets in 1841. The Camden-Street asylum was founded in 1858. Sister Blandina, one of the sisters who came with Sister Ann Alexis, was living in 1872.

About this time the cathedral began to be so crowded at all the services that the bishop found it necessary to begin to provide means of building a new church, and funds for this purpose were collected to the amount of five thousand dollars.

Some time previous to this, the Catholics had purchased a lot of land on Bunker Hill, Charlestown, and had begun to use it as a burial-place for their dead. This year an attempt was made to induce the town authorities to prevent further interments therein. It was thought that this historic ground should not be used as a place of sepulture. The Legislature was petitioned for a law that would give cities and towns authority to grant or withhold permission to bury within their borders. The Catholics opposed the passage of this law, on the ground that, in the growing anti-Catholic spirit of the time, they feared it would be used to embarrass them in giving Catholic sepulture to their dead.

About this time the flight of Miss Rebecca Reed from the Ursuline Convent in Charlestown caused some popular excitement. The fact that she was a convert from Protestantism, coupled with her sudden and secret flight and the reasons she assigned for this step, were taken advantage of by certain zealots to fan the growing flame of anti-Catholic prejudice and public distrust. On July 28 the following year (1834), another somewhat similar, but far more serious and unfortunate, event occurred in connection with this same convent, which finally led to the most disastrous and deplorable results, including the destruction of the convent by a mob.[1]

It appears that one of the nuns named Sister Mary John, in a fit of mental derangement, caused as the physician afterward said by hysteria, left the convent secretly on the night of July 28, and, going to the house of a Protestant neighbor named Runey, was at her own request conducted by him to the house of Mr. Cotting, in West Cambridge. This Mr. Cotting had formerly had two daughters in the convent school as pupils, and Sister Mary John had thus some acquaintance with the family. Mr. Cotting received her kindly. Bishop Fenwick, learning the facts of the case from the nuns, repaired that evening to Mr. Cotting's house and requested to see and converse with Sister Mary John. This request she persistently refused to comply with. The bishop was very anxious that she should return and place herself under the protection and care of her sisters in religion, or consent to be restored to her relatives, both for her own sake and on account of the misconceptions that a contrary course would arouse in the public mind, — already hostile to Catholic institutions, and peculiarly prejudiced

[1] The facts in this case are taken directly from Bishop Fenwick's journal, and do not differ materially from those found by the investigation of a committee appointed for this purpose at a public meeting held in Faneuil Hall, Aug. 12, 1834. This investigation lasted for two weeks, and the results of it are clearly stated in the admirable report of the committee, which is a matter of public record, and may be found in the collection of Bishop England's works, vol. v. p. 223. The chairman of the committee was Charles G. Loring, and it was composed of such distinguished men as Charles P. Curtis, Henry Lee, Horace Mann, Richard S. Fay, John D. Williams, William Sturgis, Benjamin Rich, Robert C. Winthrop, Nathan Appleton, Theophilus Parsons, Thomas Motley, and Edward Sohier.

against monasteries and nunneries. In this emergency the bishop had recourse to the intervention of her brother, Mr. Harrison, of Boston. The brother visited West Cambridge, and was received by his sister. After some persuasion she consented to return to the convent, after having seen the bishop and hearing what he had to say. This she did July 29, accompanied by her brother and the bishop. The next day the attack of hysteria passed away, and Sister Mary John was restored to her normal condition. With the return of mental tranquillity came back her love for the religious state, and her desire to remain in the convent. She could hardly believe the facts in the case as related to her, and was inclined to look upon what had

MOUNT BENEDICT.[1]

happened as a dream. When she could no longer withhold her credence she was greatly grieved, and was heard to cry out from time to time, "O God! where were my senses?" "How can I ever repair the injury I have done!" The bishop and the nuns did all in their power to soothe her anguish and restore her peace of mind. The physician, Dr. Thompson, directed them to keep her as composed and quiet as possible, to guard against a possible relapse. Happily this did not take place, and all would have been well had not a rumor spread that she was detained in the convent against her will, and even harshly treated by the other nuns. The public press took up and spread this rumor far and wide, and the public mind was

[1] [This cut follows a lithograph now in the dining-room of the residence of the pastor of St. Mary's church, Charlestown. There is another view of the ruins in Drake's *Landmarks of Middlesex*, p. 91. — ED.]

excited to a high pitch of indignation. Finally, some of the more ignorant and prejudiced class, including others prompted by bigotry and malice, made a demonstration against the convent on the night of August 9. About nine o'clock that night a mob of rough characters, chiefly of the laboring class, gathered about the convent grounds, crying out in loud and menacing tones, "Down with the convent!" "Away with the nuns!" Two men named Cutter, who resided in the neighborhood, constituted themselves spokesmen for the assembly, and undertook to see if there was any truth in the charge that a nun was forcibly detained in the cloister. With this end in view, they called at the convent, and requested to see the superior and Sister Mary John, so that they might hear from their own lips the truth of the matter. The superior complied with their request, and Sister Mary John declared to them that her stay in the convent was the result of her own free choice. The Cutters retired, professing to be satisfied, and so informed the mob, who soon afterwards withdrew. The nuns, however, in their great tribulation, anxiety, and fear, spent the night in watching and prayer.

The next day being Sunday, the bishop visited the convent and said mass there, as was his custom. He found Mary John full of regret for what had happened, and most anxious to be assured of his forgiveness. On the following Monday, about three o'clock in the afternoon, the selectmen of Charlestown paid an official visit to the convent, and with the permission of the superior examined it from garret to cellar. They remained for about three hours, and, having seen and conversed with Sister Mary John and the other inmates, declared that they were perfectly satisfied that everything was correct, and that they would so announce through the newspapers of the following day. Notwithstanding all this, about eight o'clock on the night of this same day (Aug. 11, 1834), a mob again began to assemble about the convent. No great apprehension of violence was, however, felt, as it was known that the civil authorities were warned in time; and it was thought that they were able and willing to protect property and keep the peace. The event proved that this supposition was not at all correct. About ten o'clock that night, when thousands had been gathered to the scene by a bonfire lighted on the adjoining land, a body of about five or six hundred ruffians made a furious assault on the convent. They broke in the windows, battered down the doors, invaded the premises, ransacked and pillaged the convent, and having broken and thrown out of doors such furniture as they could not carry away, finally set fire to the house itself, and burned it to the ground. Although an alarm of fire was sounded, and some fire companies with their engines appeared on the scene, no effectual efforts were made to extinguish the flames, — the firemen being probably overawed by the mob. Two of the selectmen of Charlestown were on the ground, but, beyond advising the mob to abstain from violence, did nothing to protect the convent. The pupils, about fifty-five in number, all young ladies, had retired to bed before the assault began. They were now hastily dressed, and hurried out of the building, followed by the nuns. All fled in scattered groups, as best they

could, and found refuge in the neighboring farm-houses until the following morning, when they were gathered together and returned to their friends. They saved nothing except what they wore at the time, not even a change of clothing. The Ursuline nuns were brought to Boston, and were temporarily lodged with the Sisters of Charity.

The citizens of Boston of the better class were filled with indignation at this dastardly outrage on defenceless women and children. The very next day a meeting was held in Faneuil Hall, in which Mr. Harrison Gray Otis delivered a speech of great power and eloquence. He denounced the perpetrators of this savage outrage as cowardly ruffians, and expressed his horror and indignation at the shameful and atrocious proceedings of the mob. Speeches of the same character were also made by Josiah Quincy, Jr., and others. Resolutions were formally passed, condemning the burning of the convent in the strongest terms. That same day, however, another mob collected about the cathedral, but the citizens were armed and prepared, and although many threats were made, no violence was attempted. The success of Bishop Fenwick in restraining the Catholics from acts of retaliation and the influence of all good citizens caused the excitement gradually to subside, and by August 19 tranquillity was perfectly restored. Thirteen of the rioters were arrested and brought to trial, chiefly through the exertions of the Faneuil-Hall committee. The Government, however, failed to convict, except in the case of Marvin Marcy, Jr., a young man who was probably the least guilty of the number. He was soon afterward pardoned on the petition of the bishop and others, it being thought incongruous that while J. R. Buzzell and other leaders in the riot remained unpunished, the least guilty should suffer.[1]

The church on Pond (now Endicott) Street, was begun about this time, and the walls were ready for the roof, Oct. 14, 1835. The basement being completed, the first mass was said therein on Christmas Day of this year. The church was afterward dedicated, under the title of St. Mary's, May 22, 1836. For a time the clergymen at the cathedral attended this church, of which the first regular pastors were Fathers Wiley and O'Beirne.

[1] Efforts were subsequently made to induce the State to make compensation for the damage done; but although a law was finally (March 16, 1839) passed covering cases of mob violence, the Legislature did not think it well to make it retroactive. The convent property has now passed into other hands, and the hill itself on which it stood is fast disappearing, the clay and gravel being used for filling up the low lands along the Mystic River.

The Ursulines, after residing for a time on a place in Roxbury, known as the Dearborn Estate, visited Quebec in 1835, and finally withdrew altogether from Boston. [The bibliography of the convent riot can be traced in J. F. Hunnewell's *Bibliography of Charlestown*, 1880. Those titles of chief importance are *The Trials*, 1834; *Documents relating to*, 1842; the several legislative reports on indemnity, 1852, 1853, 1854; some papers in the *Boston Commercial Bulletin*, Jan. and Feb. 1870, which enlarged, and reproducing much contemporary evidence, were reissued by Patrick Donahoe as *The Charlestown Convent*, 1870; Mrs. Louisa Whitney's *Burning of the Convent*, 1877, the writer having been a pupil there at the time. Rebecca T. Reed's *Six Months in a Convent* was published in Boston in 1835; followed by *An Answer* from the Lady Superior; this again by a *Reply*, intended as a vindication of Miss Reed, to whose narrative a separate *Supplement* was also printed, with an account of the "elopement of Miss Harrison." — Ed.]

The Catholics becoming quite numerous in the south end of the city, a church on Northampton Street, known as St. Patrick's, was begun in 1835. The Rev. Thomas Lynch, who was the first pastor of this church, was ordained priest July 27, 1833. The Rev. P. O'Beirne, the present venerable pastor of St. Joseph's, Roxbury, was ordained in 1835.

In 1836 a German Catholic Congregation was organized, and was given the use of the cathedral for their services, with priests of their own language to officiate for them. A charity fair in aid of the Orphan Asylum was held this year, and $2,000 realized.

The conversion of the Rev. George F. Haskins, an Episcopal minister, happened in 1840, and he was, after due preparation, ordained priest, and became the second pastor of the church of St. John the Baptist, Moon Street. Afterward he was the first pastor of St. Stephen's church on Hanover Street. He also founded and conducted the House of the Angel Guardian, an asylum for wayward and orphan boys.

Dr. O'Flaherty, somewhat noted for the distinguished share he took in a religious controversy with Dr. Lyman Beecher in 1831, was about this time appointed pastor of St. Mary's Church, jointly with Rev. Patrick O'Beirne, now the rector of St. Joseph's Church, Roxbury.

In 1841 a lot of land was purchased on Suffolk Street to serve as a site for a church for the Catholic Germans, the corner-stone of which was laid June 28 of the following year.[1] A procession, formed at St. Patrick's church, proceeded to the site of the new church, the people on foot, the bishop and clergy vested in their official robes in carriages. The Rev. Francis Roloff, the pastor, preached the sermon. In 1842 was held the first synod of the Boston diocese, in which statutes for the better ordering of discipline were enacted. Jan. 17, 1843, a lot of land on Moon Street, on which there was a large warehouse, was bought for church purposes, and after being adapted to its new uses was dedicated under the title of St. John the Baptist. It is now used as a parochial school, and its place is supplied by St. Stephen's church, Hanover Street. The first pastor was the Rev. J. B. McMahon.

The chapel of St. Augustine, although somewhat enlarged, soon proved quite insufficient for the increasing body of Catholics in South Boston. Consequently a new church was begun on Broadway in 1843. The basement hall was ready for occupancy in 1844, and the church, a fine stone structure, was dedicated in 1845, and called SS. Peter and Paul. Its first pastor was the Rev. Terence Fitzsimmons. It was destroyed by fire, Sept. 8, 1848, the flames being first discovered in the belfry. It was supposed to have caught fire from sparks from a conflagration then raging on Federal Street, near the bridge. The work of rebuilding it was soon begun, and having been reconstructed after the original designs, it was rededicated Nov. 7, 1853. The Rev. P. F. Lyndon was the second pastor, and the present Rector is the Rev. William A. Blinkinsop.

In the mean time several Catholic families had settled on the island, now

[1] The newly-erected tower fell in 1843, doing considerable damage.

called East Boston. Among those the best known were Mr. Daniel Crowley and Messrs. McManus and Cummiskey. So inconvenient was it for them to cross the ferry in order to attend church, that, as soon as their numbers gave any promise of sufficient support, it was resolved to provide them with a church of their own. In 1844 Mr. Daniel Crowley, after consultation with other leading Catholics, and with the approval of the bishop, purchased the meeting-house of the Maverick Congregational Society; and after the necessary alterations and repairs were made it was dedicated, as a Catholic church, on the 25th of February, under the title of St. Nicholas. The Rev. Nicholas J. O'Brien was the first pastor; and on his return to the cathedral, March, 1847, he was succeeded by the Rev. Charles McCallion, who enlarged the church and built a fine brick residence for the pastor. He was succeeded in 1851 by the Rev. William Wiley, who held the office till his death, April 19, 1855. In 1854 the Rev. William Wiley, finding that the congregation was rapidly increasing, secured a lot of land adjoining the old church, laid the foundations and completed the basement walls of the large and beautiful stone church now known as the church of the Holy Redeemer. Father Wiley was succeeded by the Rev. James Fitton, who continued the work and brought it to completion in 1857, when it was dedicated by Bishop Fitzpatrick. The belfry contains a fine bell, the gift of Mr. Daniel Crowley. The galleries have recently been removed, and the interior greatly improved. The old church was converted into a school-house in 1858, and the Sisters of Notre Dame have conducted the parochial school for girls therein from that date to the present time.

The Rev. J. B. Fitzpatrick was appointed Coadjutor Bishop of Boston in 1843, and consecrated March 24, 1844.



The conversion of A. O. Brownson, a Unitarian clergyman, which took place in Boston in 1844, attracted public attention.[1] He was received into the Catholic Church by Bishop Fitzpatrick. This year is also marked by the elevation to the priesthood of the Rev. John J. Williams, the present Archbishop of Boston.

In 1845 a house on Purchase Street was bought, for $18,000, for the Orphan Asylum in charge of the Sisters of Charity.

Bishop Fenwick began to fail in health in 1846.[2] He became quite ill on the 7th of August, and died on the 11th day of the same month, aged sixty-three years and eleven months. His funeral took place on the 13th of August from the cathedral; Bishop Fitzpatrick officiated, and the Rev. N. J. O'Brien preached the sermon. As it was his wish to be buried at the College of the Holy Cross,[3] of which he was the founder, his remains were taken

[1] *Brownson's Review*, for many years conducted with singular ability and success by Dr. Brownson, was also projected in this year.

[2] A portrait of Bishop Fenwick, now in the reception room of the Archbishop's house, was painted in 1845 by Mr. Pope, a celebrated portrait painter of Boston. It is said to be an excellent likeness.

[3] The College of the Holy Cross, near Worcester, was founded in 1843, by Bishop Fenwick, on a farm previously purchased by the Rev. James Fitton. The college was placed

through the streets of Boston to the Worcester Railroad station in a solemn ecclesiastical procession, the bishop and clergy vested in their robes of office. It is worthy of note that it was a French priest, the Rev. Charles E. Brasseur de Bourbourg, who carried the cross at the head of the clergy. This procession, it appears, was not contemplated in the original plan of the funeral, but was organized under the influence of the moment, at the suggestion of Bishop Fitzpatrick.

The dedication of the church of the Holy Trinity (German) took place Oct. 25, 1846. The Rev. Alex. Martini, O. S. F., preached the sermon. On the 6th of December of the same year was dedicated St. Joseph's church, Roxbury, of which the Rev. P. O'Beirne was the first pastor, and who still retains the same charge, after almost fifty years of active work in the ministry. He will celebrate the golden jubilee of his priesthood in 1885.

In 1847 a newspaper, called the *Boston Catholic Observer*, the principal writers for which were the Rev. George F. Haskins and the Rev. N. J. O'Brien, began to be published. This was the year of the famine in Ireland, and at the suggestion of the bishop a collection, amounting to $25,000, was made by the Catholics of the diocese of Boston for the relief of their suffering brethren. A similar collection was made in 1880.

Some symptoms of the Know-Nothing spirit, which then prevailed throughout the country, showed themselves in Boston in 1847. The most notable of these was the preconcerted assembly, June 16, of the lodges of Boston and vicinity at Fort Hill, a quarter thickly settled by emigrants from Ireland. The object of this was undoubtedly to provoke a breach of the peace on the part of the Irish; but the latter, warned and exhorted by the bishop and his priests to keep indoors on that day, allowed the Know-Nothings to have their triumph in peace. The forbearance of the Irish in the presence of these insulting proceedings was greatly admired by the more peaceable citizens.

The hospital on Deer Island and the poor-house in South Boston were now rapidly filling up with newly-arrived emigrants, stricken with the ship-fever. It is thought that it was owing to the Know-Nothing spirit then prevailing that the priests were at first prevented from visiting the Catholics who were dying in these hospitals. The right to administer religious consolation to these poor emigrants was afterward conceded at the earnest solicitation of Bishop Fitzpatrick. This concession was, however, hampered by conditions that seem to us now wholly unnecessary. The Battle of Bunker Hill was celebrated on the 17th of June this year by a display of no-popery

in charge of professors of the Society of Jesus, and members of that order still continue to conduct it. The object of this college was to provide education in the higher branches, and also in the classics, under Catholic auspices, and to cultivate vocations to the priesthood.

In 1849, an attempt was made to procure a charter from the Massachusetts legislature for the College of the Holy Cross. Bishop Fitzpatrick appeared in its behalf before the committee on education, and Charles W. Upham of Salem and other distinguished legislators advocated the granting of the petition. An act granting a charter to the college was passed, and became a law; but it was repealed the following year. A charter was finally granted

banners in City Square, Charlestown. About this time occurred the conversion of Captain Chandler and the ordination of the Rev. Joseph Coolidge Shaw, a convert to the Catholic Church.

On the 19th of September of this year the Rev. P. F. Lyndon became pastor of St. Mary's church, Charlestown, in place of the Rev. George F. Goodwin, deceased. During his pastorate he enlarged the church to its present size, giving it a seating capacity of about one thousand; and he also built a new pastoral residence. St. Mary's, Boston, was placed in charge of the fathers of the Society of Jesus, Oct. 24, 1847, and the same society still continues to furnish pastors for this church, of whom the Rev. John McElroy, S. J., was the first. In 1848 died Dr. Green, a convert to the Roman Catholic religion, originally from Maine, and still gratefully remembered in Boston as one of the chief founders of St. Vincent's Orphan Asylum for girls.

The influx of emigrants from Ireland was now rapidly increasing the Catholic population of certain districts of the city. Among the places where these emigrants found tenements in large numbers was the Fort-Hill district; and it soon became necessary to furnish church accommodations in that vicinity. About this time it happened that a stone church on Purchase Street was offered for sale for $30,000. Mr. Andrew Carney was instructed by the bishop to buy it, which he did May 1, 1848, binding the contract by a bond for $10,000. When the sellers found that the building was to be used as a Catholic church, such was the pressure of public opinion upon them that they sought to recede from their agreement. Knowing they were held by the bond, they offered to pay $3,000 to have the contract rescinded. This offer was rejected, and the church passed into the possession of the Catholics. It continued to be of great utility to them till it too, like the old cathedral on Franklin Street, had to disappear before the onward march of business. It was attended for a time from the cathedral. The Rev. M. T. Gallagher was its first regular pastor. The Rev. E. J. Sheridan, at present of Taunton, was also for several years pastor of this church, which was known as St. Vincent's; and when it was taken down in April, 1872, the stone was used in building a church of the same name in South Boston. The present pastor is Rev. W. J. Corcoran.

In 1850 an ordinance passed the city council prohibiting further interments in the Catholic Cemetery in South Boston. This was a great grievance to Catholics at the time, as they had then few places of burial, and the laws of their church forbade them to bury their dead in Protestant cemeteries. A test case was brought into court, and it was found that the city had exceeded its authority in issuing this prohibition. Again the Legislature was appealed to for a general law giving cities and towns authority to control burials within their limits. Bishop Fitzpatrick, sharing in the fears of Catholics that in the then existing state of the public mind such a law would be used to force them to bury in Protestant cemeteries, appeared in person before the committee in charge of the bill, opposed its passage, and finally,

with the aid of friendly members and other moderate men, succeeded in postponing legislation on the subject to more favorable times.

July 24, 1849, Father Mathew, the great apostle of temperance, arrived in Boston from Ireland. He was accorded a public reception by the city authorities, and granted the use of Boston Common and Faneuil Hall in which to hold public meetings and administer the total-abstinence pledge. On the 27th of July he spent the entire day in Faneuil Hall, giving the pledge to men of all religious denominations. About four thousand took the pledge that day. The Bishop of Boston extended the hospitalities of his house to Father Mathew, and placed the cathedral at his disposal for the advancement of the cause of temperance. During the whole of July 30 he was detained in the cathedral, giving the pledge to the multitudes that flocked to him.

The Sisters of Notre Dame, from Cincinnati, arrived in Boston Nov. 10, 1849, and took charge of St. Mary's school for girls; the Sisters of Charity, previously in charge, having been withdrawn to Emmettsburg, Maryland. Sister Louis Gonzaga, was the first superior of this community in Boston, and she is described as a woman of remarkable religious zeal, combined with great business and executive ability.[1]

The Rev. Thomas Shahan, present pastor of St. James's church, was ordained priest in 1849. During the year 1850 Dr. Brownson delivered a lecture on "Our Times" in the city of Boston; and Archbishop Hughes, of New York, preached a sermon in the Holy Cross cathedral. About the beginning of this year some stir was made in the German Catholic congregation by the refusal of the pastor, Father Eck, S. J., to officiate at the marriage of one of his flock who had joined the secret society of Odd Fellows; the bishop, being appealed to, sustained the pastor in his refusal.

The Rev. Edward H. Welch, S. J., a member of a well-known Boston family, and who some years previously had become a convert to the Church of Rome, arrived home from abroad in 1850. He had the honor of being made the bearer of palliums for three archbishops, — Purcell of Cincinnati, Blanc of New Orleans, and Smith of Trinidad; he is now a distinguished preacher of the Society of Jesus, and is at present stationed at the church of the Immaculate Conception, Boston. In 1851 the cathedral was repaired, at an expense of $3,000, one half of which was obtained by assessing the pew-owners, and one-half by voluntary contributions. This year Bishop Fitzpatrick received, October 7, a novel invitation. It came through a duly accredited agent of the newly elected Emperor of Hayti, and was to the effect that the bishop would kindly proceed to that island and consecrate him, and also administer confirmation throughout the island. The bishop refused, on the ground that Hayti was not within the ecclesiastical jurisdiction of the diocese of Boston.

[1] This sisterhood first occupied a house on Stillman Street, where they resided from Nov. 13, 1849, to May 1, 1852, when they moved to the convent on Lancaster Street. The central house of these sisters is now at the academy on Berkeley Street, which was founded July 3, 1864. The first superior of this academy was Sister Alphonse Marie.

The institution known as the House of the Angel Guardian was established this year by the Rev. George F. Haskins, who conducted it most successfully until his death. The first collection in the cathedral for this object amounted to $1,500. It was at first located on land adjoining the church on Moon Street, near North Square.

Jan. 4, 1852, the Rev. John J. Williams took charge of the small Catholic chapel on Beach Street, which had been opened in 1850 to meet the religious wants of the rapidly-growing Catholic population that settled about the South Cove, and was attended at first by Dr. Ambrose Manahan. Patrick Mooney, for twenty-five years sexton of the cathedral, died April 14, 1852.

The Otis School-house, on Lancaster Street, was purchased from the City, May 31, 1852, for $16,500. It was intended to be used for a boys' school, under the direction of the Jesuits; and it was hoped that from it would in time be developed a Catholic academy, in which the classics and higher English branches could be studied. It is now used as a parochial school for girls, taught by the Sisters of Notre Dame.

April 5, this year, the first movement was made toward building a church in the South-Cove district. This was done at a meeting of Catholics held in the chapel of the Holy Family, on Beach Street. The meeting was presided over by Bishop Fitzpatrick, and arrangements were made for the collection of funds to purchase a suitable site for a new church. Such a site was soon found at the corner of Albany and Harvard streets, and was bought Feb. 18, 1853. The corner-stone was laid July, 1853, and the basement chapel was used for the first time, Christmas day, 1854. The church was completed and dedicated, Sept. 23, 1855, by Bishop Fitzpatrick. The Rev. Thomas F. Mullady, S. J., preached the sermon on this occasion. The Rev. John McElroy, S. J., preached at vespers. It was a large brick structure, built in the Gothic style, after designs furnished by P. C. Keely, architect. The first pastor was the Rev. David Walsh. The Very Rev. J. J. Williams, V. G., was pastor of this church at the time he was made Coadjutor Bishop of Boston. Recently the church and land were bought by the Boston & Albany Railroad Company, and on its site now stands one of their large freight houses. The old church was replaced by the new St. James's church, on Harrison Avenue, which was built under the direction of the Rev. James A. Healy, now Bishop of Portland. The new church is Roman classic in style, and is one of the finest churches in the city; it seats fourteen hundred. It was dedicated April 10, 1875, by Archbishop Williams. Its present rector is Rev. Thomas Shahan.

In 1853 a lot of land on Tremont Street was bought by the Catholic Germans, with the design of building a new and larger church. This church was actually begun, and the walls carried a few feet above the foundations, before it became apparent that it was projected on a scale too large for the means of the congregation; and the work was consequently discontinued in 1855. The sudden illness of the pastor, and his consequent absence in Europe, also contributed greatly to this untoward result.

A large district lying chiefly in Roxbury, between the Providence Railroad and Washington Street, and having many Catholic families within it, was still unprovided with a church. In 1853 a Baptist church on Ruggles Street was bought, and, after the necessary alterations were made, was dedicated to Catholic worship under the title of St. Francis de Sales, when Father Rodden preached the sermon. This church was afterward destroyed by fire, and the present church of the same name, on Vernon Street, projected by the Rev. George F. Haskins. The new church was completed under the direction of the subsequent pastor, the Rev. James Griffin. The corner-stone was laid Sept. 29, 1867, by the Very Rev. P. F. Lyndon, V. G., and the church was dedicated June 20, 1869. The same clergyman officiated on this occasion, and the sermon was preached by the Rev. M. J. O'Farrell, then of Montreal, now of St. Peter's, New York. The present pastor is the Rev. John Delahunty, who is rapidly redeeming it from debt. In the mean time the congregation that was gathered in the Ruggles-Street church worshipped in the chapel of the House of the Angel Guardian.

In the year 1853 occurred, in Charlestown, the incident known as the "Hannah Corcoran" riot. A young girl, whose real name was Mary Joseph Corcoran, who together with her mother had recently arrived in this country from Ireland, was employed as a domestic servant, under the name of Hannah, in the family of Mr. Carpenter. While there she began to attend the First Baptist Church, it is said, with the knowledge and consent of her mother. She was even rebaptized in that church, according to the Baptist form of immersion. Her mother, after a time repenting of the consent she had given, resolved to bring her daughter back to the Catholic Church. With this end in view, she took her away from Mr. Carpenter's house and sent her secretly to Philadelphia. Meanwhile, Deacon Carter, of the First Baptist Church, had caused himself to be appointed guardian of the girl, and in that capacity proceeded to demand her return. The Rev. P. F. Lyndon, then pastor of St. Mary's, Charlestown, who was known to have been consulted by the mother, was appealed to. Some suspicious or malicious persons set a rumor afloat that the girl was forcibly detained either in the church vestry or in the priest's house; and a repetition of the scenes which took place at the burning of the convent was for a time threatened. Inflammatory articles appeared in the newspapers; the pastor of the First Baptist Church, the Rev. Thomas F. Caldicott, prayed and preached in a manner to arouse the feelings of his auditors; and finally hand-bills were distributed, inviting "the friends of liberty" to assemble from all quarters on the evening of March 1, in front of the Catholic church on Richmond Street, and there demand that the girl be produced. As there was no mistaking the meaning of this proceeding, and as threats of tearing down the church were freely uttered, the Mayor of Charlestown — Hon. Richard Frothingham — resolved to be prepared to repress any attempts at violence. He ordered out the City Guards, which responded with full ranks, and the marines at the Navy Yard were held in readiness to act

in case of need. One hundred men of the police force of Boston were sent over to assist the local officers. The street immediately in front of the church, between Union and Austin streets, was barricaded. The mob assembled at the time appointed. The mayor proceeded to the scene, and, in the presence of a display of force, read the Riot Act, and ordered the multitude to disperse, which it did about midnight, without attempting any violence. Next day the mother of Hannah Corcoran made affidavit, which was published in the papers, to the effect that she knew where her daughter was, and that she would be forthcoming in a short time. March 5, the girl, accompanied by her mother, returned from Philadelphia, and again placed herself under the protection of Deacon Carter. Notwithstanding this, the excitement continued for some days, and the church had again to be protected from mob violence on the night of March 8. Soon after this, however, the trouble was over, and the public mind settled down to its normal condition. This was the last riot of the kind we read of in our annals.

On April 13, 1853, another effort was made in the Legislature to have the State indemnify the Catholics for the damage done by the burning of the Ursuline Convent by a mob. James Egan, a Catholic member of the Legislature and a member of the Suffolk bar, made an eloquent and powerful speech in favor of the bill, and it passed to a second reading by a large majority. It was, however, finally rejected by a vote which stood — yeas, 111; nays, 120.

On April 20 of this year the Rev. P. F. Lyndon was appointed pastor of SS. Peter and Paul's church, South Boston, in place of the Rev. Terence Fitzsimmons, removed.

About this time the bishop purchased a plot of four acres of land in Roxbury, on the Dedham turnpike. This he intended for the site of a convent for the Sisters of Notre Dame. A convent of this order stands there now, and is used as a novitiate of the order and an academy for young ladies. Its success is chiefly due to Sister Aloyisus, the first Superior.

On Sunday, Sept. 25, 1853, Mons. Bedini, Papal Nuncio to Brazil, assisted at mass at the cathedral, and Bishop O'Reilly, of Hartford diocese, preached. On the following Sunday the Nuncio officiated pontifically in the same place; and during the subsequent week visited the various public and Catholic institutions of the city, and was hospitably entertained by some of the citizens.

The mission of Nuncio Bedini not being clearly defined nor correctly understood, his travels in the United States gave rise to various misconceptions on the part of the Protestant populace, and led to some civic commotions in a few places. In 1854 a false rumor having spread that the Nuncio was to pay a second visit to Boston, a mob of two or three hundred disorderly persons assembled, February 1, before the bishop's house, about midnight; but beyond uttering insulting cries, intended for the ears of the Nuncio, nothing was done. The mob seemed to be inflamed by a false report which had gained credence in the States to the effect that Bedini, while

Governor of Bologna, in 1848, was the prime mover in the conviction and execution of certain Red Republican agitators of Italy.

Nov. 3, 1853, the Catholic clergy of Boston established, by subscription among themselves, a fund for the purpose of giving aid to each other in case of sickness or incapacity from old age. This foundation is still in a flourishing condition, and is of great utility.

At the rededication of SS. Peter and Paul's church, Broadway, November 27, the bishops of Boston, Albany, and Hartford were present, and the Rev. Dr. Ryder, S. J., preached the sermon.

The number of Catholic children baptized in Boston in the year 1853 was four thousand one hundred and seventeen, showing a probable Catholic population of about eighty thousand souls.

The burning and subsequent rebuilding on the same site of the church in South Boston led to an important legal decision regarding the rights of pew-owners under such circumstances. The case is known as Fields *vs.* Tighe; and the decision established the fact that the legal rights of pew-owners perish with the destruction of the church, and do not revive even if another is rebuilt on the same site. Notwithstanding this decision, the bishop satisfied the claims of the pew-owners in an equitable manner.

On March 26, 1855, a committee of the Legislature, accompanied by twelve or thirteen others not of the committee, paid a visit of officious as well as official inspection to the Catholic academy and convent in Roxbury, known as the Academy of Notre Dame. The members of the committee, as soon as they were admitted, scattered themselves over the whole house, and, without waiting for any guidance, entered every room, chapel, and dormitory, and inspected every cellar, garret, and closet in the building. They insisted on seeing and conversing with every inmate of the house, lest, perchance, as they said, any should be detained there against their will. This uncalled-for suspicion and insolent intrusion were very annoying to the nuns and pupils, and were greatly resented by the Catholic community. Indeed, it may be said that in all decent society the conduct of the committee was condemned; and the members were everywhere subjected to well-merited ridicule. So decided was the public censure, that the Legislature investigated the conduct of its committee, and finding that one of the members — Mr. Hiss — had been particularly ungentlemanly in the convent visitation, they expelled him by a vote of the House, May 12, 1855.

January 20, of this year, the Rev. John J. Williams was appointed rector of the cathedral in Franklin Square.

The attendance at the Lenten services at the church of the Holy Cross continued this year to be immense, notwithstanding the fact that the basement of the new St. James's church was then opened and provided with similar services, which were also largely attended.

Sept. 10, 1856, a contract was made for building a wing of a new structure in which to conduct the academy at Roxbury. This building was finished in the spring of the following year. Up to that time the school was con-

ducted in a frame dwelling-house which stood upon the land when purchased. The centre and a fine chapel are now completed.

The lot on which the House of the Angel Guardian now stands, on Vernon Street, was bought from the Norfolk Land Company, about the close of this year. Meanwhile, certain lands belonging to the city, on Leverett Street, and known as the Jail lands, were purchased with the intention of building thereon a college for boys and a Catholic church, both to be in charge of the Jesuits. It being found difficult to obtain the removal of certain restrictions on these lands, in the year 1857 they were surrendered to the city, and the proper steps taken to secure a suitable lot at the South End for the same purpose. A division of opinion among the Land Commissioners of Boston about the expediency of selling any of the city lands for Catholic church purposes, and some popular opposition manifested in the public press and otherwise, retarded the negotiations for a time; but a suitable lot was finally secured. Boston College stands on this lot.

This year Bishop Fitzpatrick showed such symptoms of failing health that, with the advice of his physicians, he resolved to retire for awhile from active duty. He passed the summer months at Worcester College, and in the fall of that year took a trip to the Adirondack Mountains, for the purpose of recruiting his health. He returned greatly benefited, but not completely cured, so that he had to work with caution, and take frequent rests during the year 1858.

The Rev. Michael Moran, the present pastor of St. Stephen's church, was ordained a priest of this diocese, Aug. 15, 1857, by Bishop Bacon, of Portland. Thirty-two acres of land for a Catholic cemetery were this year purchased, within the limits of Dorchester and Roxbury. Dec. 3, 1858, the Rev. John Rodden died at the bishop's residence. Father Rodden was a fertile writer for the Catholic papers of his day, and was for a time editor of the *Boston Pilot*, which was established in the year 1838, by Patrick Donahoe. The present editor is John Boyle O'Reilly, — a celebrated poet and a distinguished Irish patriot.

The foundation of the church of the Immaculate Conception, on Harrison Avenue, was laid in the spring of the year 1858, and the completed structure — one of the finest stone churches in the city — was opened for divine worship, March 10, 1861.[1] Archbishop Hughes, of New York, preached the dedicatory sermon. The high altar and two side altars were consecrated by the bishops of Newark, Brooklyn, and Hartford. The Bishop of Boston, having dedicated the church, celebrated mass pontifically. The Rev. James A. Healy — then Chancellor of the Diocese, now Bishop of Portland — conducted the ceremonies. A procession, consisting of about fifty Jesuit scholastics and thirty priests all in surplices, followed by seven bishops vested in their official robes, started from the adjoining college, and, entering the church from Harrison Avenue, took places in and

[1] P. C. Keely, of Brooklyn, N. Y., was the architect of the church.

about the sanctuary. A well-trained choir, supported by a powerful organ,[1] rendered the music in a most acceptable manner. The sermon at vespers was preached by the Cardinal Archbishop of New York, then Bishop of Albany. The first pastor of this church was Father McElroy, S. J.

In the spring of this year the question of discontinuing the reading of the Protestant version of the Bible in the public schools was agitated. The Catholics complained that while the public schools were professedly non-sectarian, and only used by them as such in the absence of Catholic schools, the practice did not strictly correspond with the theory. All the pupils, of whatever denomination, were obliged to recite from the Protestant Bible, to the exclusion of the Douai version, which the Catholic Church approves. The Lord's Prayer was recited with a closing doxology as an integral part thereof, which in that connection was strange to Catholic ears. Protestant hymns, such as *Old Hundred*, were sung by all the children in common, led by their teachers; and the Ten Commandments were taught and recited in the form in which they are given in the Protestant Bible. A boy named Whall, a pupil in the Eliot School, refused, with the approval of his parents, to recite these passages of Scripture, and was consequently severely flogged for disobedience. He was afterward, with a number of other boys who followed his example, suspended from attendance at the school, and the parents notified that if the boys would not consent to conform to the rules of the school, they could not be readmitted. They would, moreover, under these circumstances, be liable to arrest and imprisonment for truancy. In the latter case they would be sent to the city penitentiary, where they would be wholly under the control and at the mercy of the keepers and instructors, who were all Protestants, and known to be animated with a spirit of proselytism. To avoid this graver danger, the bishop advised the parents to direct their boys to submit, under protest, for the time; and promised to take immediate steps to have the rules amended, and these grievances removed, by the proper authorities. With this end in view the bishop addressed a letter to the School Committee, in which he clearly set forth the objections of the Catholics and the principles involved in the case, and urgently pleaded for a change in the regulations, in the interest of peace, justice, and fair play. Consideration of this proposal was indefinitely postponed by the committee, and the matter was not satisfactorily arranged till some years afterward. Most of these objectionable practices are now discontinued in the public schools of Boston. The Catholics, in the mean time, are building schools of their own, preferring a religious education for their children to any system of mere secular instruction, and making great sacrifices for their support.

An action for assault in the above case was brought into court against Mr. Cook, the teacher who had punished the boy Whall. The action was dismissed, Judge Maine being on the bench. Durant was counsel for Cook, and Sidney Webster for Whall. This trial, and the speeches made by the

[1] The organ was built by Hook & Co., of Boston.

opposing counsel, attracted a great deal of public attention at the time, and aroused considerable bitterness and uncharitableness on both sides. Soon after this, Father Wigget, S. J., opened a school for boys at the North End, which subsequently grew into the large and very successful school for many years connected with St. Mary's church, and still conducted by the Jesuit Fathers, on Cooper Street, in a school-building purchased from the city.

May 15, 1859, the corner-stone of the new building of the House of the Angel Guardian was laid by Bishop Fitzpatrick, in the presence of the Mayor and Common Council of the city of Roxbury, and an immense concourse of people. Dr. Cummings, of St. Stephen's church, New York, preached the sermon. July 19, of this same year, the new orphan asylum for girls, on Camden Street, was dedicated under the patronage of St. Vincent, the apostle of charity.

The corner-stone of St. Francis de Sales' church, Charlestown, — the building of which is due to the Rev. George A. Hamilton, — was laid on a site secured for that purpose on the summit of Bunker Hill proper. Archbishop Purcell, of Cincinnati, was the preacher on this occasion. The Mayor of Charlestown, many city officials and ex-mayors, and the Commandant of the Navy Yard were present; and the multitude in attendance was computed to be not less than six thousand.

This year, 1859, witnessed the first step in the celebrated transfer of the old cathedral lands on Franklin Street to Isaac Rich, who intended to use the site for building warehouses to accommodate the rapid increase of the business of Boston. The deeds, owing to various legal complications, were not actually passed till Sept. 30, 1860. The last mass in the old cathedral was celebrated Sunday, Sept. 16, 1860. The bishop officiated, assisted by the Rev. James Fitton, the Rev. John J. Williams, and the Rev. Michael Moran. An address, explaining the necessity of this step, prepared by the bishop's own hand, was read to the people by his secretary, the Rev. James A. Healy, now Bishop of Portland.

The Catholic college on Harrison Avenue, known as Boston College, was dedicated Sept. 17, 1860. Rev. R. Fulton, S. J., was its best known president.

The first purchase of land for a site for a new cathedral was made Oct. 24, 1860. The property was known as the Williams Estate, situated on the corner of Washington and Malden streets. The adjoining estate, bordering on Union-Park Street, was added to this, January 3 of the following year. The price paid for these lots was $75,000. By the purchase of additional lots, in order to obtain sufficient space not only for a cathedral, but for a residence for the bishop and his clergy, the entire proceeds of the sale of the old cathedral, amounting to $115,000, were expended on land for the new. On this land there stood two dwelling-houses, one of which, until the building of the new episcopal residence, was occupied by the bishop. On June 23 the architect, P. C. Keely, came to view the site, and soon after began to prepare the plans for the basement. It was decided to build of Roxbury stone, with granite trimmings, in the Gothic style. The ground

was broken for the foundations, April 27, 1866, and the corner-stone was laid June 25 of the same year. The basement chapel was ready for occupancy towards the close of 1873, and was first used for divine service on December 7 of that year. The chapel was in use for some time previously.

In the mean time the cathedral congregation, after using the Melodeon Hall for some time, worshipped in Castle-Street church, which was purchased from Harvard College, and dedicated as a pro-cathedral, Dec. 2, 1861. This ceremony was performed by the Very Rev. J. J. Williams, V. G., who was then administering the affairs of the diocese, the bishop being absent in Europe for his health. The Rev. James A. Healy preached the sermon, and the Bishop of Burlington officiated at vespers.

Since the opening of the new cathedral, Castle-Street church is still used every Sunday for the accommodation of those in the immediate neighborhood. Recently a French congregation was organized, and given the use of it until they leased Freeman Place chapel, which they now use.

Jan. 3, 1861, by order of the bishop, mass was said in all the Catholic churches of the city and diocese, at which the people were invited to assist and pray for the preservation of the Union, and the maintenance of peace; as the signs of the times unfortunately indicated the near approach of civil war.

The church of St. Francis de Sales, on Bunker Hill, Charlestown, was dedicated June 17, 1862. The Right Rev. Louis Goesbriand, Bishop of Burlington, officiated, and the Right Rev. Sylvester Rosecranz preached the sermon. There were present about forty priests, and a very great multitude of people. The present pastor is Father Supple.

The church on the corner of Hanover and Clark streets, known as the New North Church, was purchased by the Catholics, September 26, of this year. It was dedicated under the title of St. Stephen's, November 27, and took the place of the church on Moon Street, which had become much too small for the crowded Catholic population of the North End. The Very Rev. John J. Williams performed the ceremony, and Dr. Cummings of New York preached the sermon. The first pastor was the Rev. George F. Haskins. This church was greatly enlarged and very much improved in its interior, in 1875, through the exertions of the Rev. M. Moran, who succeeded Father Haskins as rector of this church. The debt contracted is being rapidly reduced.

During this same year 1862, the twelfth Congregational church on Chambers Street, at the West End, was purchased by the administrator of the diocese. This church was rededicated under the title of St. Joseph's. The Rev. Hillary Tucker, then in charge of a small chapel in the vicinity, celebrated the mass. The Rev. John Boyce, of Worcester, preached the sermon. The first pastor was the Rev. P. T. O'Reilly, now Bishop of Springfield. The first Catholic services in this vicinity were conducted in a small hall by Dr. Manahan, and afterward by the Rev. John J. Williams. Such was the increase of Catholics in this section of the city that it was soon found neces-

sary to enlarge this church also. This work was begun during the pastorate of the Rev. Bernard O'Reilly, and was completed by the Very Rev. P. F. Lyndon, vicar-general of the diocese, after he took charge of the church, Sept. 5, 1870. A fine house in the rear of the church on Allen Street was secured as a residence for the clergy. The basement of the church was fitted up for a Sunday-school, and the whole interior beautifully frescoed and elegantly decorated. The present pastor is the Rev. W. J. Daly.

A new church near South Boston Point, which was built under the direction of the Rev. P. F. Lyndon, was dedicated March 19, 1863, under the title of the Gate of Heaven, the corner-stone having been laid May 1, 1862. The Rev. Bernard A. Maguire, S. J., preached on the occasion. Bishop McFarland officiated, the Bishop of Boston being abroad at the time. A commodious pastoral residence was afterward built in this parish on a lot adjoining the church, by the Rev. James Sullivan. The Rev. Emeliano Gerbi, O. S. F., was for some years pastor of this church. The present rector is the Rev. Michael F. Higgins, who has built a convent in the vicinity of the church to serve as a residence for the Sisters of St. Joseph, who conduct the schools of the parish. These schools were established by the Rev. William A. Blinkinsop, soon after the foundation of the Catholic school for girls near the church on Broadway, which is taught by the Sisters of Notre Dame. The convent of the Sisters of St. Joseph is a handsome brick structure, complete in all its appointments, and in its arrangement of rooms and apartments is a model in its way. Some of the rooms are used for classes studying the higher English branches and music. It is provided with a spacious play-ground for the children attending the parochial school.

This year also witnessed the erection of a large brick church in Dorchester, which was built and paid for through the exertions of the Rev. Thomas McNulty, its first pastor, and was dedicated April 7, 1864, under the title of St. Gregory. The Very Rev. P. F. Lyndon, V. G., performed the ceremony, assisted by the Rev. Thomas Scully and the Rev. W. J. J. Denvir. The sermon was preached by the Rev. James A. Healy, chancellor of the diocese. The present pastor of this church is the Rev. W. H. Fitzpatrick, who has just completed a small church in Neponset, to be entitled St. Ann's. The Home for destitute children began this year.[1]

Bishop Fitzpatrick returned from Europe Sept. 1. 1864, and the priests of the diocese, to the number of eighty, assembled at his house to welcome him home, and presented him with a formal address and other testimonials of their regard. The presentation was made in behalf of the clergy by the

[1] The Home for Destitute Catholic Children began as the Eliot Charity School, No. 9 High Street. In 1864 an association was formed consisting of the Rev. James A. Healy, Patrick Donahoe, Patrick H. Powers, Owen Lappan, Charles F. Donnelly, and others. In January, 1866, the Sisters of Charity took charge of the Home, which was soon afterwards transferred to No. 10 Common Street. The corner-stone of the Home on Harrison Avenue was laid October, 1870, and the building occupied the summer following. The celebrated Irish Dominican preacher, Father Tom Burke, delivered in the fall of 1872, in the Jubilee Colosseum, a lecture in aid of the Home, which realized the extraordinary sum of $11,435.

Rev. Menassas P. Dougherty, of Cambridge. The bishop was not much improved in health by his stay in Europe, and about the middle of December was taken so seriously ill as to cause great alarm to his friends. The Very Rev. John J. Williams was appointed, in 1866, Coadjutor, with right of succession, to Bishop Fitzpatrick.

Bishop Fitzpatrick died at the episcopal residence, near the site of the new cathedral, Feb. 13, 1866. The funeral services were conducted at the pro-cathedral, corner of Washington and Castle streets, February 16, the members of the St. Vincent de Paul's society having kept the night watches over the remains in the mean time. Bishop Goesbriand celebrated the mass of requiem; the Rev. James Fitton assisted, and the Rev. Edward O'Brien, of New Haven, and the Rev. A. Sherwood Healy were the deacons. Archbishop M'Closkey delivered the funeral oration. The bishops present on this occasion were Archbishop Spaulding, of Baltimore, and Bishops Tinon, Loughlin, Bacon, Bailey, McFarland, Conroy, and Williams. A procession, formed of the clergy and the various Catholic societies of the city, moved from the church to the cemetery in South Boston, accompanied and followed by an immense multitude, and amid the tolling of the bells of the city.

Soon after this, March 11, Bishop Williams was consecrated at St. James's church, of which he was the rector, and immediately entered upon the duties of his office. He went to reside at the cathedral residence April 2, 1866, and the Rev. James A. Healy succeeded him in the rectorship of St. James's church. Bishop Williams was then about forty-four years of age, his birthday being April 27. On the 2d of April of this year the Rev. William Byrne was appointed to succeed the Rev. James A. Healy in the office of the chancellor of the diocese. The Rev. T. Maginness, the present pastor of the church of St. Thomas, Jamaica Plain, was ordained priest this year.

The corner-stone of the chapel of the Carney Hospital was laid Aug. 12, 1866. The sermon was preached by the Rev. Fr. Hitzleberger, S. J. The late Andrew Carney, of Boston, had purchased in 1863, at a cost of $13,500, a house and a lot of land on Dorchester Heights, South Boston. This he presented to the Sisters of Charity for the purpose of having a hospital established there. By his will a sum of money amounting to $56,722 was also left towards this hospital and the chapel above mentioned. A part of the centre and one entire wing of the hospital has been for some years completed, at a cost of $108,423. The hospital was incorporated in 1865, but has no endowment, and subsists entirely by the charity of the public and the payments made by such patients as require, and can afford to pay for, private rooms. It is open to all classes and creeds, and its wards are continually filled by charity patients. It has a staff of surgeons and physicians, recruited from the ranks of the medical profession of Boston, and is at present in charge of Sister Simplicia and fourteen other Sisters of Charity. The number of patients treated in 1879 was five hundred and forty. There is a debt of about $30,000 still due on the building. On the medical staff of this institution we find such eminent physicians as Drs. Bowditch,

Blake, Shattuck, Langmaid, Dwight, and Hasket Derby, the celebrated ophthalmist.

The Sisters of the Good Shepherd, whose mission is the reformation of fallen women, established a house of their order in Boston, May 2, 1867. This was at first located on Allen Street. The sisters afterward moved to a larger house at Mount Pleasant, and now occupy a brick building erected for them and their wards near Brookline. This house is supported wholly by charitable offerings and the profits of the industry of the sisters and inmates, and continues to make every year many conquests from the ranks of vice and infamy.

A church in the fourth section of East Boston, built by the Rev. James Fitton, the indefatigable pastor of the Island Ward, was dedicated under the title of Star of the Sea, Aug. 16, 1868.

A portion of South Boston, in the vicinity of St. Augustine's chapel, was set off in 1868 as a separate parish, and the charge of building a new church and administering its affairs conferred on the Rev. D. O. Callaghan.[1] He entered on his duties August 22, and has ever since worked with such zeal and energy, and has so completely secured the cordial co-operation of his flock, that the church is now completed. The church is of brick, in Gothic style, and is one of the most successful efforts of its architect, P. C. Keely. Nov. 8, 1880, the pastor had the happiness of seeing the crowning cross placed on the lofty and elegant spire of a church which is hardly surpassed by any in the city. The work is so far paid for that the ordinary revenues of the church will probably suffice to meet the interest on the debt and the current expenses.

Jan. 4, 1869, the Rev. Thomas Maginness took charge of a church in Jamaica Plain, now a part of the city of Boston, which was begun by the Rev. P. O'Beirne, of St. Joseph's, Roxbury. The corner-stone of this church was laid August 15 of this year. The sermon was preached by the Right Rev. P. T. O'Reilly, Bishop of Springfield. The church was dedicated, when completed, under the title of St. Thomas Aquinas, Aug. 17, 1873. There is now attached to it a convent and a novitiate of the Sisters of St. Joseph, who teach the schools of the parish. The church is of brick, of a good style exteriorly, and very elegantly finished within. The third church in East Boston was begun Aug. 29, 1869, of which the Rev. Jos. Cassin is now pastor. The sermon on the occasion of laying the corner-stone was preached by the Rev. R. W. Brady, S. J. This church was dedicated Nov. 6, 1873, under the title of the Assumption of the Blessed Virgin. The Rev. James Fitton celebrated the mass, and the Rev. Edward H. Welch, S. J., preached the sermon. This church is also of brick, and is neatly frescoed by Brazer. There is a school here also.

During the absence of Bishop Williams in Europe, from Oct. 19, 1869, to June 27, 1870, — that is, during the period of the Vatican Council, — Vicar-General Lyndon administered the affairs of the diocese.

[1] Ordained priest June 29, 1865.

The Rev. Thomas Lynch, pastor of St. Patrick's church, Northampton Street, died March 27, 1870, and was succeeded by the Rev. Joseph H. Gallagher. Through the exertions of the latter, a new church of ample dimensions was built on Dudley Street, near Mount Pleasant.

The corner-stone of the new St. Patrick's church, on Dudley Street, was laid by Bishop Williams July 13, 1873. The Rev. Father Freitag, of the Redemptorist order, preached the sermon, and the music was rendered by the Boston Catholic Choral Union. St. Patrick's new church was dedicated, Sunday, Dec. 5, 1880, by the archbishop, assisted by the Very Rev. William Byrne, V. G.; the Rev. M. Moran, the Rev. P. Ronan, the Rev. W. J. J. Daly, and the Rev. Michael Gilligan, acting as deacons. The Right Rev. P. T. O'Reilly preached, and about forty priests attended. There is also a fine pastoral residence, which stands on the lot adjoining the church.

The new house of the Little Sisters of the Poor, now so well and so favorably known in Boston, is located in the neighborhood of this church. These sisters came to Boston, April 20, 1870, and rented a house on Springfield Street, to be used as a home for destitute aged persons. In a short time they were able to purchase an estate on Dudley Street, Mount Pleasant, and had the chapel of their new home dedicated Dec. 8, 1874. They first occupied the new central part of their main building July 5, 1880. Mother Cecilia was the first superior. They now care for ninety old men, and eighty-six women. The sisters find no difficulty in procuring, through charitable donations, sufficient food for the poor under their care, and are only embarrassed in providing room to lodge them. This is one of the most deserving charities in the city, and citizens of all creeds and classes seem to recognize this fact, judging from the liberality of their donations in clothing, provisions, and money.

The corner-stone of the large and splendid church edifice at Meeting-House Hill, Dorchester district, which was projected and built of stone quarried on the site, under the direction of the Rev. Peter Ronan, its present rector, was laid Aug. 24, 1873. Father Freitag preached the sermon on this occasion also. The church is to be dedicated under the title of St. Peter's.

This year a small Baptist meeting-house on North Bennet Street was bought, and converted into a Catholic church for the use of the Portuguese and Italians. The old title of the Moon-Street chapel, St. John the Baptist, was given to this church. The Portuguese alone now worship in this church, the Italians having built a small chapel of their own on Prince Street, which is named for St. Leonard of Port Maurice. The present pastor of the Portuguese is the Rev. H. B. M. Hughes, a venerable missionary father who has seen service in many lands, and speaks as many languages. The pastor of the Italians is Father Boniface, of the Franciscans.

Under the auspices and management of the Catholic Union of Boston a grand festival of three days' duration was conducted in Music Hall, about Nov. 13, 1873, in honor of Pope Pius IX. This was one of the most bril-

liant and impressive demonstrations ever made by the Catholics of Boston. An eloquent address was delivered on the occasion by the Rev. Kent Stone, a recent convert to the church.

June 12, 1874, a fourth church in East Boston was dedicated in honor of the Sacred Heart of Jesus. The Rev. L. P. McCarthy is the pastor. The church was built under the supervision of that veteran church builder, the venerable missionary and church historian, the Rev. James Fitton, from whose records these facts in relation to East Boston are gleaned.

A fourth church in South Boston was also dedicated this year. This was the new St. Vincent's church, built under the direction of the Rev. Michael Lane, since deceased. The mass of dedication was celebrated by the Rev. W. A. Blinkinsop, and the sermon delivered by Father Wissell, of the Redemptorist missions.

July 31, occurred the lamented death of the Rev. George A. Hamilton, pastor of St. Mary's, Charlestown. At his funeral the vicar-general of the diocese celebrated the mass in the presence of the bishop, a large number of the clergy, and a multitude which not only crowded the church, but the space and street in the vicinity. Bishop Lynch, of Charleston, S. C., delivered the panegyric. The Rev. John O'Brien, at present engaged in building a large stone church in East Cambridge, was for several years a co-laborer of Father Hamilton, at St. Mary's, Charlestown.

August 30, the bishop solemnly dedicated the new St. Augustine's Church, South Boston. The Rev. F. E. Boyle, of Washington, D. C., preached in the forenoon, and the Rev. A. S. Healy at vespers. There is a fine brick pastoral residence attached to this church.

Sept. 7, 1874, the Rev. William Byrne was appointed rector of St. Mary's church, Charlestown, and was succeeded by the Rev. T. A. Metcalf.[1] The St. Mary's Infant Asylum in Dorchester was opened, Sept. 8, 1874.

A church in West Roxbury, built by the Rev. Thomas Maginness, was burned down this year, December 15. It was afterward rebuilt, and was for some years in charge of the Rev. R. J. Barry, now building a church in Hyde Park.

The Rev. James A. Healy, rector of St. James's church, having been made Bishop of Portland, Maine, his brother, the Rev. A. S. Healy, for some years professor at Troy seminary, and for a time rector of the cathedral, was appointed pastor of that church, April 5, 1875. He died soon after his removal to St. James's. His funeral, which took place October 23, was attended by about one hundred and fifty clergymen, the members of the Catholic Union, and a congregation which completely filled the large

[1] About this time arrived from Rome, where they had completed their studies, the Rev. Theodore A. Metcalf, the Rev. J. B. Smith, the Rev. J. B. McMahon, and the Rev. J. E. Millerick. The two latter are now stationed at St. Stephen's, Boston; the Rev. J. B. Smith is the present rector of the Cathedral, and the Rev. Theodore A. Metcalf succeeded the Rev. William Byrne, in the office of chancellor. He was also for a time rector of the Cathedral, and conducted therein some of the most important ceremonies that it has yet witnessed, — such as the dedication, the conferring of the pallium, and the solemn requiem for Pope Pius IX.

new church on Harrison Avenue. The Rev. Thomas Shahan succeeded him, Oct. 29, 1875. He has already made some progress in reducing a heavy debt which has continued to burden this parish ever since the building of its first church. He has also established a parochial primary school for boys.

April 18, 1875, St. Stephen's church, enlarged and improved was re-dedicated, Bishop O'Reilly, of Springfield, preaching the sermon.

On May 2, 1875, occurred one of the most notable events in the history of the Catholic Church in Boston. This was the ceremony of conferring the pallium of an archbishop on the Right Rev. John J. Williams. The new cathedral, not then quite finished, was temporarily fitted up for the occasion. Bishop McNeirney, of Albany, celebrated the solemn high mass, Bishop Goesbriand preached the sermon, and the pallium, which had been brought from Rome by an ablegate of the Pope, — Mons. Cesar Roncetti, accompanied by his secretary, Dr. Ubalbi, and a nobleman of the Papal Guard, Count Marefoschi, — was conferred on Archbishop Williams by Cardinal M'Closkey, of New York, in the presence of all the bishops of the ecclesiastical province of New York, and the clergy of this and the neighboring dioceses, and before an assembly of about six thousand persons. The music was rendered in a creditable manner by the cathedral choir, augmented for the occasion. A sanctuary choir of boys and young men, which had been trained by Mdlle. Gabrielle de la Motte, sang portions of the service with rare precision, correct expression, and remarkable power. This choir continues to sing in the sanctuary of the cathedral every Sunday. The ceremonies were conducted in an admirable manner by the Rev. T. A. Metcalf and the Rev. Hugh Roe O'Donnell. The preparations for the occasion were made under the efficient supervision of the Very Rev. P. F. Lyndon, vicar-general of the diocese.

On June 6, 1875, in accordance with the provisions of a law which, through the efforts of Senator Flatley and others, had just passed the Legislature, the first Catholic religious service was held in the chapel of the State-prison by the Rev. William Byrne, pastor of St. Mary's church, Charlestown. These services were continued every Sunday for the benefit of the Catholic prisoners, and are still held in the chapel of the new prison at Concord. The same religious privileges are also enjoyed by the Catholic inmates of the reformatory and charitable institutions of the city.

The centennial of Daniel O'Connell, the emancipator of Ireland, was celebrated in Boston, August 6 of this year. The Rev. Robert Fulton, S. J., preached a sermon in St. James's on the occasion, and the evening was observed by a grand civic banquet, at which appropriate speeches were made by several distinguished citizens.

The Rev. Robert Fulton, S. J., having by his wise and energetic management succeeded in paying off the entire debt of the church of the Immaculate Conception, the archbishop, Aug. 15, 1875, solemnly consecrated the church, assisted by the bishops of Albany, Burlington, Spring-

field, and Providence. The Bishop of Burlington preached the sermon at vespers. The Rev. R. Fulton, S. J., is now pastor of a church in New York.

The dedication of the new cathedral of the Holy Cross, which with the exception of the spires was now completed, took place Dec. 8, 1875. His grace, the Archbishop, officiated. Bishop Lynch, of Charleston, S. C., preached the sermon. All the bishops of the new ecclesiastical province of Boston were present, together with about one hundred and fifty priests, and a congregation that not only filled the immense auditorium of the cathedral, but overflowed by thousands into the adjoining streets. The Catholic Choral Society rendered the music, a sanctuary choir of boys and young men taking their share in the work, to the great satisfaction of all.

The new episcopal residence being completed, the archbishop and the clergy of the cathedral began to occupy it about this time. This residence was built by the contributions of the clergy of the diocese, and stands at the corner of Harrison Avenue and Union-Park Street. The burial crypt under the cathedral being now ready, the body of Bishop Fitzpatrick, which had been temporarily deposited in a tomb in St. Augustine's cemetery, was transferred to the cathedral and laid in a vault with the usual religious rites and ceremonies.

April 20 of this year the Rev. John Delahunty succeeded the Rev. James Griffin in the rectorship of St. Francis de Sales' church, Vernon Street, and now occupies that position. On April 25 of this year occurred the death of a priest whose history brings us back to the palmy days of the old cathedral on Franklin Street. This was the Rev. Nicholas J. O'Brien, who was ordained priest in 1842, and was for some years pastor of the church in East Boston.

The mission fathers of the Society of the Holy Redeemer, who are chiefly engaged in giving missions in the various parish churches in aid of the regular pastors, purchased the Dearborn estate in Roxbury. On this site the corner-stone of a new church edifice, one of the finest in New England, was laid with the usual pomp and ceremony on May 28, 1876. Bishop Healy preached the sermon. On the night of that same day the house occupied by the fathers caught fire in some mysterious way, and was burned to the ground. They have since replaced the old mansion by a more commodious dwelling-house. The church was dedicated April 7, 1878.

At the dedication of the splendid new church of the Germans on Shawmut Avenue, May 27 of this year, the venerable Father Weninger, S. J., preached the sermon. The present rector of the cathedral, the Rev. J. B. Smith, was appointed Sept. 23, 1876. The new convent at Jamaica Plain was dedicated March 8 of this year.

St. Mary's, Endicott Street, having been for many years too small for the congregation, was at length taken down and replaced by the present magnificent edifice, which was constructed after designs furnished by P. C. Keely, and under the supervision of his son. The principal part of the

work was done under the direction of the Rev. R. W. Brady, S. J. But he, having been made superior of his province, was obliged to transfer his residence to Baltimore. The Rev. W. Duncan, S. J., took his place, and having brought the church to completion, had it dedicated by the archbishop, Dec. 16, 1877. The Rev. R. W. Brady, the former pastor, preached the sermon; the event stands among the most important in the history of the Catholic Church in Boston.

The Rev. Michael Lane, of St. Vincent's, South Boston, having died February 2 of this year, was succeeded by the Rev. W. J. Corcoran, the present pastor.

A grand requiem service for Pope Pius IX., who died Jan. 7, 1878, was conducted in the cathedral, January 14, in the presence of one of the largest audiences that ever assembled there. Quickly following this event came the death of the Very Rev. P. F. Lyndon, V. G., which occurred at the pastoral residence of St. Joseph's Church. He died April 18, and was buried at the cathedral, April 22. The archbishop officiated at the obsequies, and the Rev. James Fitton preached the funeral sermon. The funeral procession from St. Joseph's church to the cathedral was very large, and was witnessed by a great multitude of people, who lined the streets through which the funeral *cortége* passed.

The Rev. William J. Daly succeeded the vicar-general as pastor of St. Joseph's Church, and is now in the exercise of that office. The school question came up again for discussion this year, and the archbishop delivered an address to his clergy on the subject.

July 15, 1878, the office of vicar-general was conferred on the Rev. William Byrne, of St. Mary's church, Charlestown. The fiftieth anniversary of this church — the oldest in the diocese — was observed with becoming solemnity, May 10, 1879. The archbishop celebrated mass pontifically in the old church. Bishop O'Reilly preached an historical discourse on Sunday, and the Rev. R. J. Barry, now of Hyde Park, preached on the following day, when the festival closed with a meeting of the parishioners in Monument Hall, at which addresses were made by the Very Rev. J. J. Power, V. G., of Worcester, and several members of the congregation.

November 3, the new convent of the Sisters of St. Joseph, near the Church of the Gate of Heaven, in South Boston, was opened and dedicated. Feb. 20, 1880, the Ladies of the Sacred Heart — another order of teachers — were introduced into Boston, and located their school temporarily in a large house on Chester Park at the South End.

The most recent event of importance in the history of the Catholic Church in Boston is the purchase of a large estate in Brighton for the purpose of erecting thereon an ecclesiastical seminary in which the future priests of the diocese are to be educated. This institution will be conducted by certain priests of the congregation of St. Sulpice, Paris. This order has successfully conducted for many years similar institutions in Montreal and Baltimore.

The present condition of the Catholic Church in Boston may be summed up as follows: The probable Catholic population of the city in the year 1880 was about 150,000 souls. These worship in 30 churches, attended by 90 priests, under the guidance of their archbishop. There are 10 parochial schools, chiefly conducted by the Sisters of Notre Dame. They have 3 colleges and academies in the city, 5 orphan asylums, 3 hospitals, and a home for their aged poor. The societies that flourish among them are religious sodalities and pious confraternities. They have also many temperance societies and literary associations. Conferences[1] of the charitable society of St. Vincent de Paul are established in every parish, and are continually at work among the poor, relieving their wants, and laboring for their improvement.[2]

[1] The first conference of this society was established in St. James's Parish, in 1862. In addition to its labors among the very poor, this society, to some extent, continues the work of the Young Catholics' Friend Society, which for a quarter of a century did excellent service among the poorer children of Boston, providing them with proper clothing, bringing them into the Sunday-schools, and teaching them Christian doctrine.

[2] The material of this chapter is for the most part taken from the original records preserved in the archives of this diocese, and from the files of the *Boston Pilot*. [It may be well to remember that Dr. J. G. Shea contributed to the *American Catholic Quarterly Review*, April, 1881, an important paper on "The Earliest Discussion of the Catholic Question in New England." — Ed.]

CHAPTER XV.

CHARLESTOWN IN THE LAST HUNDRED YEARS.

BY HENRY HERBERT EDES.

THE one great event in the history of Charlestown, that which gave her not only a national, but a world-wide fame, — the Battle of Bunker Hill, — has been described in another chapter.[1] The conflagration which attended that struggle reduced the town to ashes, and the inhabitants from affluence to poverty. During the siege of Boston, that part of Charlestown which was above the peninsula, or "without the Neck," was mostly occupied by the American troops; and it was not until after the evacuation of Boston, in March, 1776, that a portion of the former inhabitants began to return, and to repair their waste places. The British *Annual Register*[2] for 1775 observed: —

"Charlestown was large, handsome, and well built, both in respect to its public and private edifices; it contained about four hundred houses, and had the greatest trade of any port in the province, except Boston. It is said that the two ports cleared out a thousand vessels annually for a foreign trade, exclusive of an infinite number of coasters."

In his *Historical Sketch of Charlestown*,[3] Dr. Josiah Bartlett[4] says concerning the rebuilding of the town: —

"A few . . . were able to erect convenient dwellings, whilst others, like their hardy predecessors, were only covered with temporary shelters. . . . By a consideration of mutual sufferings, it was the endeavor of every individual to meliorate the

[1] By Dr. Hale, on "The Siege of Boston."

[2] Page *136.

[3] Printed in 2 *Mass. Hist. Coll.*, ii. 163–84 (1814). I would here acknowledge my indebtedness to Dr. Bartlett's pages for some facts which appear to have been nowhere else preserved. Dr. Bartlett wrote also a brief sketch of the town, which appeared in the first two numbers of the *American Recorder*, December 9 and 13, 1785, the first newspaper printed in Charlestown, or in the county of Middlesex. It lived only till May 25, 1787. There is another sketch in Barber's *Historical Collections of Massachusetts*, pp. 364–374. In 1838 Mr. William Sawyer (H. C. 1828) published large extracts from the town records in the *Bunker Hill Aurora* (newspaper), which had its early home in the "stone building" erected about 1822 by William and Nathaniel Austin at the junction of Main, Harvard, Bow, and Pleasant streets. The *Aurora* was published from July 12, 1827, till Sept. 24, 1870.

[4] Cf. *Mass. Hist. Soc. Proc.*, i. 325.

condition of his neighbor; to cultivate harmony, and unite for the benefit of the whole. A block-house,[1] erected by the enemy at the place [Town Hill] originally fortified against the natives, was appropriated to the discharge of our civil duties, to the public services of religion, and to the education of youth. Here, uninfluenced by political dissensions, we gave our first suffrages for a chief magistrate and legislators under the constitution of this Commonwealth. . . . The principal streets were widened, straightened, and improved, and the Market Square was regularly laid out soon after the opening of the town, in 1776; to facilitate which a lottery was granted, and the State taxes were remitted for seven years."

In October, 1796, President Dwight visited Charlestown, while on a journey through New England. His account of this place,[2] presents a picture different from that drawn by Dr. Bartlett. He says: —

"The town is built on the southern and western sides of the peninsula. The streets are formed without the least regard to regularity. The middle of this peninsula is a hill, extending almost the whole length, and crowned with two beautiful eminences, the south-eastern named Breed's Hill, and the other, Bunker's Hill. On the southern and western declivities of this hill stands Charlestown. After it was burnt, the proprietors had a fair opportunity of making it one of the most beautiful towns in the world. Had they thrown their property into a common stock; had the whole been then surveyed; had they laid out the streets with the full advantage furnished by the ground, which might have been done without lessening the quantity of enclosed ground; had they then taken their house-lots, whenever they chose to do so, as near their former positions as the new location of the streets would have permitted, — Charlestown would have been only beautiful. Its present location is almost only preposterous. Such a plan was, indeed, sufficiently a subject of conversation; but a miserable mass of prejudices prevented it from being executed. The houses in this town are all new, many of them good, and some handsome. The situations of some of them, also, are remarkably pleasant, particularly those in the southern declivity of Breed's Hill.[3] . . . After the town was burnt, a part only of its former inhabitants returned. Its additional population has been formed by strangers from many places,[4] and of almost every description. The bonds by which they are united are, of course, feeble. . . . The inhabitants of Charlestown are not a little divided in their parochial, town, and public concerns; and this division prevents much of the pleasure of life which might otherwise be found on so charming a spot."

Between April 7, 1775, and Jan. 26, 1776, there is no record of any meeting of the inhabitants or the selectmen. At the selectmen's meeting, Jan. 26, 1776, routine business was transacted, and a warrant issued "in His

[1] It occupied a part of the site of the present meeting-house of the First Parish.

[2] Dwight, *Travels in America* (London ed., 1823), i. 426–37.

[3] Cf. *notes* on pp. 552–53, 557, 562.

[4] This fact is fully attested by the census taken by Samuel Swan, Jr., and Benjamin Hurd, Jr., in February, 1789, and still in the town archives. June 19, 1786, Mr. [Eleazer?] Wyer was ordered to take a census of the inhabitants; but the result of his labors, if he obeyed the order, is not known to be now extant.

Majesty's name," for the annual March meeting, which was appointed for March 6, at 9 o'clock A. M., at Mr. Jeremiah Snow's, innholder in Charlestown. It was also agreed that the sufferers by the burning of the town should be publicly requested to make out just estimates of their losses, and hand them, before March 6, to Seth Sweetser[1] at Medford, Nathaniel Frothingham at Malden, Stephen Miller at Woburn, or John Larkin at Cambridge. At the March meeting town officers were chosen, — Judge Gorham,[2] the moderator, being placed at the head of the selectmen; but the principal business related to the losses just referred to. A committee of thirteen, consisting of the selectmen, Richard Devens,[3] and five others, was appointed to estimate the loss sustained by the town and the inhabitants, "agreeable to the recommendations of the Continental Congress." This committee was increased (April 3) to nineteen, any seven to constitute a quorum. An advertisement in the public prints requested the inhabitants to hand in schedules of their losses to the committee, which was to "meet at the house of Mr. Cooper, innholder, in Menotomy [Arlington], on Tuesday, the 26th of this instant March, at nine o'clock A.M., and so from day to day till the business is completed." The estimates, as revised by the committee, aggregated £117,982 5*s.* 2*d.* sterling.[4] Besides the meeting-house, a court house,[5] county house, prison, work-house, and two school-houses, more than three hundred and eighty dwellings and other buildings were burned, June 17, 1775, rendering the whole population of the peninsula, about two thousand persons, homeless.

On May 4, 1776, the selectmen issued their warrant, "in the name of the government and people of the Massachusetts Bay," for a town-meeting on the sixteenth, when it was voted to send three representatives to the General Court, which was to convene at Watertown on the twenty-ninth; and to raise no money by taxation, the town's income being suf-

[1] Cf. *Ante*, II. 320, 321.

[2] The Hon. Nathaniel Gorham was the most distinguished man who ever made Charlestown his permanent home. His public services were various and important; and the matrimonial alliances of his children and grand-children were remarkable. His portrait is in possession of Mr. Brooks Adams (H. C. 1870). Cf. Thacher's *Funeral Sermon*, June 19, 1796; Welch's *Eulogy*, June 29, 1796; and Wyman, *Genealogies and Estates of Charlestown*, pp. 423–25.

[3] Richard Devens was the founder of his family. He was born here in September, 1721. In early life he was a cooper; but he became a highly prosperous merchant, and at his decease, Sept. 20, 1807, at the age of eighty-six, he left an estate valued at about $120,000, a part of which was bestowed in charity. (Cf. *Panoplist*, iii. 239.) The cut on the next page follows his portrait by Henry Sargent, now in the Charlestown Branch of the Public Library, to which it was bequeathed by Miss Charlotte Harris. Cf. Wyman, *Genealogies and Estates of Charlestown*, pp. 289–92; and Frothingham, *History of Charlestown*, chap. xxv.–xxix.

[4] The purpose in making this estimate was to secure, if possible, partial or complete compensation for the damages suffered. Several persistent but fruitless efforts were made to that end. Cf. U. S. House of Rep. Doc. No. 55, Twenty-third Congress, First Session, 1833–34.

The original schedules of property destroyed fill two folio volumes. They afford an interesting glimpse of the social life of that period.

[5] An unsuccessful attempt was made in 1812 to re-establish the courts of law in Charlestown.





ficient to defray "the charges that will unavoidably arise." On May 28 the town —

"*Voted*, unanimously, that it is the mind of the inhabitants that our representatives be advised, that if the Continental Congress should (for the safety of the Colonies) declare them independent of the Kingdom of Great Britain, they will, in that case, solemnly engage with their lives and fortunes to support them in that measure."

The town clerk[1] was instructed to communicate this vote to the town's representatives.

Of all who sought the protection of the British Crown, upon the evacuation of Boston, only one, Thomas Danforth (H. C. 1762), was a resident of Charlestown. He was the only lawyer in the town; had been an addresser of Hutchinson; went to Halifax; was proscribed and banished; and died in London, March 6, 1820.[2]

In August, 1776, a committee was sent to represent to the Council that the quota of ten men called for by the General Court had been already furnished, the town claiming credit for John Larkin, enlisted at Cambridge, five negroes, belonging respectively to Thomas Russell, [the Rev. ?] Mr. Prentice, John Austin, Jr., Isaiah Edes, and Caleb Call, and for Ebenezer Frothingham, Thomas Orgain, Samuel Adams, and John Green, who had enlisted in neighboring towns; but the claim was not admitted, and Charlestown immediately responded to this and all subsequent calls, with alacrity.[3]

[1] Seth Sweetser. (Cf. *ante* II. 321.) His successors in office were: Walter Russell, who was of the Cambridge family, chosen March 2, 1778;



Samuel Swan, March 1, 1779; Timothy Trumbull (H. C. 1774), March 6, 1780; Samuel Swan, Oct. 23, 1782; Samuel Holbrook, the schoolmaster, March 3, 1783; Samuel Payson (H. C. 1782), March 5, 1787; Phillips Payson (H. C. 1778), Aug. 3,



1801; John Kettell, at one time postmaster, March 3, 1806; Samuel Devens, March 2, 1812;



John Kettell, March 1, 1813; David Dodge, schoolmaster, March 7, 1814; John Kettell,



March 2, 1818; Charles Devens, Sept. 30, 1822; and David Dodge, March 7, 1825. Mr. Dodge was annually rechosen till April 26, 1847, when he was unanimously elected first city clerk. He resigned Jan. 25, 1848. His long and faith-



ful services to town and city, and the accuracy, precision, and elegance of his records were re-



cognized by the city government in resolutions adopted when his resignation was accepted, March 15. His portrait, by Wetherbee, is in possession of Mr. Abraham B. Shedd, who was chosen his successor in office April 10, 1848. Mr. Shedd's successors were: Charles Poole, elected March 24, 1851; Daniel Williams, Jan. 13, 1862; and John T. Priest, the present assistant city clerk of Boston, who was elected May 23, 1871.

[2] Cf. *Columbian Centinel* for May 20, 1820; Sabine, *Loyalists of the American Revolution*, i. 358, 359.

[3] In January, 1787, the town sent the Charlestown Artillery Company (organized June 17,

The attention of the people was at once given to rebuilding. A controversy early arose between the inhabitants and the former residents as to the finances and the right of the former inhabitants to vote in town-meetings upon questions involving their individual proprietary rights, which were to be affected by the proposed amending of the public highways. This trouble was not composed till the close of 1778.[1] The next year the town voted to cover all the wells and vaults, which were then in a dangerous condition. In 1780 (June 24) it was "*Voted*, that all the streets, lanes, etc. within the Neck shall be laid open from the first day of May next;" and a committee appointed to consider the alterations proper to be made in the streets reported (September 29), estimating the cost at £2,600[2]

The alterations were to be confined principally to the main street and streets about the Square. The same year John Leach,[3] a prominent surveyor of Boston, made a plan[4] of the proposed changes, which were sanctioned by an act of the General Court the next year. When the new lines were established, building proceeded rapidly. The oldest house[5] now standing is the mansion of the late Captain Robert Ball Edes on Main Street. It was built by his great-grandfather, David Wood, Sr., soon after the reoccupation of the town, on the site[6] of his former place of abode, which was burned, June 17, 1775. It is remarkable also as the birthplace of Samuel Finley Breese Morse





1786) to aid in suppressing Shays's Rebellion, and in consequence was excused from sending any of its militia. In 1804 were organized the Warren Phalanx, once commanded by Lieut.-Governor Samuel T. Armstrong, and the Charlestown Light Infantry, called "the Blues," for a time under the command of General Austin.

[1] Cf. Town Records, viii. 321–23.

[2] The actual cost was £4,595, 3*s*. 7*d*. plus $80, the alterations being more extensive than was at first contemplated. The street committee's accounts were not finally settled until Nov. 19, 1791. (Cf. Town Records ix. 299, 300, 377.) After the great fire of August, 1835, Charles River Avenue, Warren, Joiner, Chambers, and Water streets were widened or straightened, Gill Street discontinued, and Chelsea Street laid out. In advocating these improvements Dr. William J. Walker (H. C. 1810), the distinguished physician and surgeon, then resident here, was earnest and foremost. Dr. Walker was a son of the Hon. Timothy Walker, and cousin to the Rev. Dr. James Walker. (Cf. Mr. Dillaway's chapter in Vol. IV. for an account of Dr. Walker's munificent bequests to various institutions of learning.) In 1838 a board of street commissioners was established. Mr. Samuel Morse Felton (H. C. 1834), civil engineer, now of Philadelphia, was one of the original board.



[3] Cf. *N. E. Hist. and Geneal. Reg.*, xix. 255, 313.

[4] Cf. Editor's Introduction to the present volume, under the years 1775, 1780, 1794, 1818, 1830, and 1848; and Admiral Preble's chapter.

[5] Cf. *note* on p. 562.

[6] This estate was in the possession of Robert Chalkley, prior to 1656. His widow, Elizabeth,

sold the property to Josiah Wood in 1676, and it remained in the uninterrupted possession of



his descendants for nearly two centuries. It was inherited, in 1818, by Thomas Edes, Jr., whose mother was a daughter of David Wood,

THE EDES HOUSE.

THE FIRST DWELLING ERECTED AFTER THE DESTRUCTION OF THE TOWN, JUNE 17, 1775.

(Y. C. 1810), the inventor of the electric telegraph, who was born, April 27, 1791, in the front chamber of the second story, on the right of the front door of entrance. A few months previous to that time, his father, the Rev. Dr. Jedediah Morse, had accepted the hospitality of his friend and parishioner, Mr. Thomas Edes, Sr., while the parsonage, on Town Hill, was in building. Some delays occurring in the work, Dr. Morse's visit was prolonged until after the birth of his eldest and most distinguished child.[1]



In 1783 the roadway over Bunker Hill was opened. The barracks, built there by the British during their occupancy of the town, were sold and removed about the same time. In 1785 (February 7) the town chose Nathaniel

Sr. (Cf. *note* on p. 562.) The heirs of Captain Robert Ball Edes conveyed it, in 1864, to Leonard B. Hathon, who adapted the lower story of the house to purposes of trade. The cut represents the building as it appeared early in the present century. Cf. Wyman, *Genealogies and Estates of Charlestown*, pp. 197, 322, 323, 895, 1045–47.

[1] Cf. *Belknap Papers* (5 *Mass. Hist. Coll.*), ii. 254. Professor Morse died April 2, 1872.

Gorham, Samuel Nicholson, Captain Joseph Cordis, David Wood, Jr., John Larkin, Dr. Josiah Bartlett, Isaac Mallett, John Austin, Samuel Swan, and Joseph Hurd[1] a committee to petition the General Court to grant the petition of Thomas Russell, Esq., and others for liberty to build a bridge across Charles River where the ferry was then established.[2] An act was obtained the same year, the corporators being Governor Hancock, Thomas Russell, Nathaniel Gorham, James Swan, and Eben Parsons. The bridge was completed in 1786, and was opened June 17, amid "the greatest splendor

CHARLESTOWN IN 1789.

and festivity."[3] It was 1,503 feet long and 43 feet wide. In 1791 the town actively opposed the building of a bridge from West Boston to Cam-

[1] Mr. Hurd was representative in 1814. Cf. Edes's *History of the Harvard Church in Charlestown*, pp. 123, 124, 264, 265.

[2] The same committee was instructed to oppose the petition of John and Andrew Cabot for liberty to build a bridge from Lechmere Point to New Boston.

[3] Cf. Bartlett's *Historical Sketch of Charlestown*, pp. 172, 173; *American Recorder* (newspaper) for June 20, 1786; and *Massachusetts Magazine* for September, 1789 (i. 533), which describes the structure and contains a view of it, reproduced in the woodcut in the text, showing also the Square and the new meeting-house with its unfinished spire. The bridge was built by Samuel Sewall. [In the manuscript note-book of Robert Gilmor, of Baltimore, who was in Boston about this time, there is a view of Charlestown from the west end of Cambridge bridge. It is in the Boston Public Library. A view of Boston, from Breed's Hill, is given in Mr. Stanwood's chapter in Vol. IV., and follows an engraving in the *Massachusetts Magazine*, June, 1791 (iii. 331). There is in the *Gentleman's Magazine*, February, 1790, a crude view of Bun-

bridge; and in 1796 assumed a similar attitude toward a proposed bridge from Chelsea to Moulton's Point.[1] In 1804 a new bridge to Boston was proposed. The town voted, "unanimously," to oppose the scheme. In March, 1828, however, an act creating the Warren Bridge Corporation was passed by the Legislature, in which John Skinner, Isaac Warren,



John Cofran, Nathaniel Austin, Ebenezer Breed, and Nathan Tufts[2] were named as corporators. This enterprise, in which General Austin[3] was a prime mover, and which continued to enlist his zealous support for more than thirty years, was violently opposed[4] by the Charles River Bridge Corporation, whose property was to be materially injured thereby.[5] The shares fell from $1,950 in 1823 to $825 in 1824, during the agitation of the project, even before the charter was granted.[6] In November, 1835, the town voted to avail of the option offered by the Legislature to take one half of Warren Bridge and half the bridge fund, preparatory to open-



ker Hill, from the slope of Copp's Hill, taken by an officer of the twenty-second regiment, at the time when Howe was encamped there, after the battle. The ruins of Charlestown, the tents of the encampment, the wharfed shore, with a few buildings and a ship on the Boston side, are shown. A view taken from the Navy Yard about 1825 is in Edes's *History of the Harvard Church in Charlestown*, p. 133. It was drawn by the wife of the late Commodore James Armstrong, U.S.N. A view of Charlestown in 1826, from the dome of the State House, is in Snow's *Boston*, p. 316. A view of Charlestown, from Copp's Hill, about 1840, is in Barber's *Historical Collections of Massachusetts*, p. 364. — Ed.]

[1] Chelsea Bridge was built in 1803, at a cost of $53,000, under an act of the Legislature passed in 1802, incorporating certain persons for the purpose of building a turnpike road from Salem to Charles River Bridge in Charlestown. One half of the 2,400 shares in this bridge belonged to the Malden Bridge Corporation, which was chartered in 1787 to build a bridge at Penny Ferry (*ante*, I. 393). The bridge cost £5,300, and was built in six months. Cf. *Massachusetts Magazine* for September, 1790 (ii. 515), for a description and view of the structure.

[2] Nathan Tufts, a wealthy citizen, who died in October, 1835, aged 71, was uncle to Charles Tufts, the founder of Tufts College, who was born July 17, 1781, and who died Dec. 24, 1876.

[3] The Hon. Nathaniel Austin was High Sheriff of Middlesex and Major-General of the Massachusetts Militia at the same time. His mother was a daughter of Dr. Isaac Rand (H. C. 1761), a distinguished physician and president of the Massachusetts Medical Society. General Austin died here April 3, 1861, in his ninetieth

year. Cf. Wyman, *Genealogies and Estates of Charlestown*, pp. 32, 785, 786. See p. 564, *note*.

[4] The contest between these rival corporations was long and bitter. Both decisions of the Supreme Judicial Court of Massachusetts (1828, 1829) were against the older corporation (6 Pickering, 376; 7 Pickering, 344). The case was appealed to the Supreme Court of the United States, where it was argued for the plaintiffs by Mr. Webster. At the January term in 1837 Chief-Justice Taney delivered the opinion of the court, affirming the decree of the Supreme Judicial Court of Massachusetts. (11 Peters, 420.)

[5] June 6, 1823, the town had voted to memorialize the General Court in favor of a petition then before it, that the contemplated new bridge should be toll-free to foot-passengers.

[6] See a valuable report upon the affairs of the Charles River Bridge Corporation, printed in *Mass. House of Reps. Doc.*, No. 71, 1827.

ing it as a free bridge, to be maintained by Charlestown and Boston jointly; adopted a series of resolutions, and chose a large committee to confer with the Boston authorities, and to promote the success of the plan. In 1845 a bill to re-establish the tolls[1] on both bridges was introduced into the House of Representatives. Resolutions were adopted protesting against the passage of the bill, "as hostile to the interest of this town, and particularly burdensome to the laboring classes; utterly unnecessary, uncalled for, and in the highest degree arbitrary and oppressive," since there was still an unexpended balance of $30,000 belonging to the bridge fund. The town's representatives were instructed to oppose the bill. Tolls were re-established for the last time by an act passed in 1854 to raise funds to rebuild or repair both bridges and to provide a permanent repair fund of $100,000.

The Middlesex Canal, one terminus of which was in this town, at the Neck, was chartered in 1793. The survey was completed in the summer of 1794, and the canal was navigable in 1803.[2] In 1836 Boston Avenue, now known as Warren Avenue, was laid out. The same year the Charlestown Wharf Company and the Charlestown Branch Railroad were incorporated. The first named corporation was authorized to hold the water-front from the Navy Yard to Lynde's Point. The Fitchburg Railroad Company, chartered in 1842, succeeded to the Branch Railroad, and acquired much of the Wharf Company's property. The Middlesex Horse Railroad Company was incorporated April 29, 1854.

In 1800 the National Government was seeking a site for a naval station. On March 27 it was "*Voted*, that it is the sense of this meeting that it will be of the greatest consequence to this town to have the Continental Dock and Navy Yard established in it;" and a committee was appointed to ascertain at what price the necessary land could be had. $73,200 was the price demanded by the seven owners of the land. This sum was deemed exorbitant, and another committee was appointed to make a just appraisal of the estates, under oath. They adjudged the land worth $25,180. The town then chose Dr. Aaron Putnam[3] its agent to proceed to the seat of government, and endeavor to secure the location of the Navy Yard here. He was instructed[4] to oppose the Noddle's Island site, and to call to his aid the influence of our distinguished townsman, the Hon. Samuel



[1] A previous, but unsuccessful, attempt had been made in 1840.

[2] Cf. Caleb Eddy, *Historical Sketch of the Middlesex Canal*. Boston, 1843. In 1807 a canal through Back (now Warren) Street was projected, but the plan miscarried. [See Mr. C. F. Adams, Jr.'s chapter in Vol. IV. — Ed.]

[3] Dr. Putnam was subsequently appointed agent for the United States; and in 1801 purchased and took about sixty-five acres of land for a Navy Yard. Cf. Wyman, *Genealogies and Estates of Charlestown*, p. 780.

[4] His letter of instructions is recorded in the Town Records, ix. 461–63.

Dexter, Jr.,[1] who was then one of the United States Senators from Massachusetts. The mission was successful.[2]

The establishment of a naval station in this town marked an epoch in its history. The ruin and desolation caused by the war had given place to prosperity, and the town had assumed the aspect of an enterprising and successful community. The public buildings had been rebuilt, the streets improved, and the principal ones furnished (1795) with signboards;[3] the church and the schools were re-established on firm foundations, and were in a flourishing condition; the fire department was well organized and well regulated; and the finances, which had occasioned much solicitude,[4] were in a satisfactory condition.



Notwithstanding the slender resources of the town after its destruction, the schools were not permitted to languish. As early as Sept. 15, 1777, a committee was chosen to "fit up the Block House with all convenient speed for a school-house." In 1780 the appropriation for schools was £6000; and in 1781 £100 "hard money." The next year there were three schools, — one within the Neck, taught by Timothy Trumball (H. C. 1774), the town clerk; and two others under the care of Samuel Tufts and Lieutenant Samuel Cutter. In 1792 Samuel Payson (H. C. 1782), the town clerk, was in charge of the grammar school. March 27, 1793, on petition of the town, an act was passed incorporating Richard Devens, Nathaniel Gorham, Josiah Bartlett, Aaron Putnam,



[1] The Hon. Samuel Dexter (H. C. 1781), LL.D., resided in Charlestown for several years on a fine estate, extending from Main Street to High Street on the southerly side of Green Street, now covered by Dexter Row, the Winthrop Church, and the mansions of Mr. Rhodes Lockwood, the Hon. Edward Lawrence, and ex-Mayor Sawyer. Cf. Story, *Sketch of the Life of Samuel Dexter;* and *Reminiscences of Samuel Dexter, by Sigma.* [See Mr. Morse's chapter on "The Bench and Bar," in Vol. IV. — Ed.]



The Hon. Franklin Dexter (H. C. 1812), LL.D., son of the preceding, was born here, Nov. 5, 1793.

[2] Cf. Admiral Preble's chapter in the present volume, and Edes's *Memorial of Josiah Barker*, Boston, 1871. The dry-dock was constructed by the Hon. Loammi Baldwin (H. C. 1800), 1827–34.

[3] It was not until 1826 that the streets generally were named and the numbering of the houses begun. Feb. 7, 1831, the selectmen voted to number the houses within the Neck "at once" at the public charge. Town-Hill Street was named Harvard Street on petition of Governor Everett and others, dated Nov. 7, 1836.

[4] In 1787–88 the town was obliged to sell some of its lands to liquidate its most pressing debts. In 1795 an elaborate report on the finances, signed by Josiah Bartlett and Matthew Bridge, is recorded. A new system for keeping the town's accounts was recommended, which subsequently was adopted.



Joseph Hurd, Nathaniel Hawkins, and Seth Wyman as trustees of the Charlestown Free Schools. In 1841 the number of trustees was increased to eleven. Aug. 11, 1800, the trustees of the schools were authorized to erect a new building on the site of the school-house within the Neck to accommodate the school, the town meetings, and other public business. It was built of brick, contained a town hall[1] and a room for the selectmen, and stood on the site of the present old Harvard School-house on Harvard Street. The cost was not to exceed $3,000. In 1837 that part of the nation's "surplus revenue" which was apportioned to Charlestown,[2] was set apart for the benefit of the schools. It was invested by the town treasurer in town notes. Only the interest could be expended; and it was provided that this income should in no way supersede the annual appropriation for school purposes. In May, 1846, when the trustees' annual report was considered in town-meeting, its recommendation of an appropriation of $500 for teaching music in the grammar schools was indefinitely postponed. At the annual March meeting in 1831 an attempt was made to establish an English high school.[3] A petition for such a school was received and referred to the trustees for consideration. In the following April they reported upon the project which the town voted to indefinitely postpone. In 1836 there were two determined efforts in the same direction. In March, 1837, the trustees, as requested, reported a scheme for such a school, which was ordered to be printed; and they were requested to look for a proper site and report their conclusions to the town. It was not until 1847–48, however, during the first year of the city government, that the High School-house on Monument Square was built. The corner-stone was laid Oct 7, 1847.

For five years (1778–1783) the Block House, already mentioned, served as the Sunday home of the people. June 24, 1780, it was voted to let the Training-field to the highest bidder, and use the rental to repair it. Sept. 10, 1781, the town chose a committee[4] "to solicit subscriptions of the good friends of this town throughout this State to assist us in building a meeting-house." Oct. 27, 1782, the town voted to give to the First Parish "that piece of land commonly called Town-house Hill, for the sole purpose of

[1] In 1815 a proposal to buy the Baptist meeting-house on High Street (see pp. 561–63) for a town hall was rejected because of the incumbrances upon the estate. March 11, 1816, the town voted to buy the Robbins Tavern lot on the Square at the corner of Harvard Street, for $5,200, at the same time rejecting a proposal to buy the Warren Tavern lot During the next two years a commodious building, three stories high, with cupola, was erected at a cost of about $20,000. (Cf. Town Records, xi, 25.)

The Warren Tavern, in which was Warren Hall, is now occupied in part by George S. Monroe as a market, at the northerly corner of Main and Pleasant streets.

[2] It amounted to $19,230.34, and was received May 5 and July 5, 1837. The total amount distributed in Massachusetts was $1,338,173.58.

[3] April 4, 1825, the town voted to indefinitely postpone the second article in the warrant for the meeting: "To know what measures the town will take to establish a Classical Free School."

[4] Judge Gorham, Capt. Cordis, David Wood, Jr., Capt. Eliphalet Newell, and John Brazier.

erecting thereon a house for the public worship of God;" provided it was built within five years, otherwise the grant was to be void. The new meeting-house was built the same year. It was a wooden structure,[1] 72 feet long, 52 feet wide, and 27 feet high to the eaves.[2] It had an imposing tower and an elegant steeple,[3] designed by Charles Bulfinch (H. C. 1781), of Boston. The building faced the east, being directly opposite the head of Henley Street.[4]

In 1804 the meeting-house was widened to 84 feet; and Dr. Bartlett tells us "a convenient chapel, 26 feet long, 21 feet wide, and 10½ feet high, for parish and church meetings, lectures, etc., was built by subscription in the church [amounting to $411], in 1809," in the garden "of a valuable parsonage lot, bequeathed, in 1703, by Mr. Richard Sprague."[5] March 5, 1803, the Legislature incorporated "a religious society by the name of the 'First Parish in the Town of Charlestown.'" The town opposed the petition of John Larkin and others for this act.[6] The present brick meeting-house was dedicated July 3, 1834. In 1852 the building was remodelled and a Norman tower added; into which, in 1868, a chime of sixteen bells[7] was introduced. They were given by Miss Charlotte Harris, of Boston, in memory of many of her ancestors who worshipped here.

The Rev. Thomas Prentice (H. C. 1726) retired to Cambridge in 1775, and lived there, in the house in which he was born, during the remainder of his days; although he continued his ministrations to his scattered flock here. Dr. Budington says: "After an interval of something like three years, the public worship of God and the ordinances of religion were re-established under the ministry of the now aged Prentice." The first

[1] Frothingham, *History of Charlestown*, p. 161, gives a lithographic northwest view of the building as it appeared in 1799.

[2] Cf. Bartlett, *Historical Sketch of Charlestown*, p. 170; and Budington, *History of the First Church*, p. 235.

[3] Aug. 29, 1797, the town voted to raise eight hundred dollars to discharge the debt incurred in building this steeple which, including the tower of 72 feet, was 162 feet in height from the ground to the top of the ball.

[4] It was in this building that the services in commemoration of Washington were held, Dec. 31, 1799. Cf. Town Records, ix. 452–54.

When Washington made his northern tour, during the first year of his presidency (1789), he passed through Charlestown on Thursday, October 29, when he wrote in his Diary: "Left Boston about eight o'clock. Passed over the bridge at Charlestown, and went to see that at Malden, but proceeded to the College at Cambridge, attended by the Vice-President [John Adams], Mr. Bowdoin, and a great number of gentlemen." Although he was not officially received here, he made one social call — on Major Benjamin Frothingham, a cabinet-maker, whom he had known in the army, and who was a member of the Cincinnati.

[5] Captain Richard Sprague was the most munificent benefactor of the Charlestown Church. He came from England with his father, Ralph Sprague, about 1628, and died, childless, Oct. 7, 1703, although he had been twice married. By his will he devised a large property to his nephews and nieces, to Harvard College, the poor, the Free School, and to the church. His uncle of the same name, who died Nov. 25, 1668, was also styled "Captain." Cf. *ante*, I. 384, 399; Budington, *History of the First Church*, pp. 148, 159, 192, 193; Soule, *Memorial of the Sprague Family*; and Wyman, *Genealogies and Estates of Charlestown*, pp. 887–92.

[6] Cf. Budington, *History of the First Church*, p. 237.

[7] Cf. *N. E. Hist. and Geneal. Reg.*, xxiv. 284.

celebration of the eucharist after the return of the inhabitants occurred Nov. 8, 1778, "with great solemnity and fulness of numbers beyond expectation."[1] Mr. Prentice died June 17, 1782, at the age of eighty years, and was buried here with honors.[2] His second wife was Rebecca, daughter of Lieutenant Ebenezer Austin. For nearly five years the church was without a settled minister. Mr. Joshua Paine, Jr. (H. C. 1784), eldest son of the Rev. Joshua and Mary Paine, of Sturbridge, received a unanimous call to the vacant pulpit in November, 1786, and was ordained Jan. 10, 1787. He was born Dec. 5, 1763. At his graduation the second honor, the salutatory oration, was awarded him. He received the honorary degree of A.M. from Yale College in 1787, and died here, of consumption, Feb. 27, 1788,[3] when in his twenty-fifth year. Dr. Budington remarks: "Mr. Paine was the last of a long series of pastors who died in the ministry of this church and were interred in this town."

In November, 1788, a unanimous call was extended to the Rev. Jedediah Morse (Y. C. 1783), of New Haven, Conn., who was installed here April 30, 1789, the Rev. Dr. Jeremy Belknap[4] preaching the sermon. Dr. Morse was, *ex officio*, an overseer of Harvard College, and the unsuccessful candidate of the Orthodox party for the Hollis professorship of divinity at Cambridge, in the memorable contest which resulted in the election of Dr. Henry Ware in 1805. Dr. Morse resigned his pastorate[5] in August,



[1] Church Records.

[2] Cf. *ante*, II. 319; Budington, *History of the First Church*, pp. 140–43, 233, 234.

[3] Church Records.

[4] Dr. Belknap wrote as follows to his friend Ebenezer Hazard, for several years Postmaster-General at New York, and a family connection of Judge Samuel Breese, whose daughter Dr. Morse married, May 14, 1789: —

"Boston, Jan. 24, 1789. . . . And now I must make an episode. You said in one of your late letters to me that probably Charlestown people would soon have to build a house for Mr. Morse. I let this drop in a conversation with a daughter of Mr. [Richard ?] Carey, who is one of my congregation; and 'know *one woman* by these presents' was never more completely exemplified. In a day or two it was all over Charlestown; and the girls who had been setting their caps for him are chagrined; while some of the elders of the land are really enquiring how, when, and where the house shall be got. I suppose it would be something to Mr. Morse's advantage, in point of *bands and handkerchiefs*, if this report could be contradicted; but if it cannot, O how heavy will be the disappointment! When a young clergyman settles in such a town as Charlestown there is as much looking out for him as there is for a 1000 dollar prize in a lottery; and tho' they know that but one can have him, yet who knows but *I* may be *that one?* A part of Payne's popularity there arose from this circumstance [referring to the Rev. Joshua Paine]. I say a part, for he was really an amiable character. A Mr. [John] Andrews, who is lately ordained at Newburyport, is just such an object; and I am told that the *linen* comes in largely from the female part of the parish. I could tell you more, but it would be only exposing the weakness of some good folks. Do tell Morse, if he is not *too far gone*, that it will be much in favor of his popularity, and something in his pocket, if he can come to Charlestown with his neck clear of that fatal noose; but if he cannot, I shall tremble for him, unless he should bring a yoke-fellow whom they *must worship* as much as they do him."— *Belknap Papers* (5 Mass. Hist. Coll.), ii. 97, 98. See also ii. 30, 31.

[5] His successors in the First Church pulpit are named in Dr. Tarbox's chapter in the present volume. Among them was the late Rev. Dr. William Ives Budington (Y. C. 1834), whose

1819; and he was dismissed Feb. 22, 1820. He died in New Haven, June 9, 1826.[1]

Dr. Morse was a conspicuous figure in the theological controversies of New England, which marked the early part of this century; and his literary works were numerous. He was the author of the first geography printed in America. His pioneer work appeared in New Haven in 1784. The *American Universal Geography*, in two volumes, was brought out in 1792.[2] His best known historical work is *A Compendious History of New England*, first printed in 1804, the name of the Rev. E. Parish appearing on the title-page as joint author with Dr. Morse. It was this book which provoked the controversy between Dr. Morse and Miss Hannah Adams.[3] But Dr. Morse will be chiefly remembered as the leader and special champion of the Orthodox party in the Unitarian controversy.[4] He was prominent in the efforts which resulted in the establishment of the theological seminary at Andover, and the founding of Park Street Church in Boston.[5] In his own parish the two parties, Orthodox and Unitarian, were quite evenly balanced, with a small numerical preponderance in favor of the former. The Unitarians, although numbering in their ranks three quarters of all the property holders of the parish, and nearly all the elements of culture, influence, and social standing in the town, withdrew peacefully from the church and society without demanding any portion of the church funds or plate, or even challenging their possession by those who remained; and quietly established the Second Congregational Society, of which more is to be said presently.

Dr. Morse's ministry was marked by much internal dissension. In 1800 a considerable number of his parishioners withdrew and formed a Baptist Society. Its first meeting-house was built at the head of Salem Street, on the corner of High and Pearl streets. It was dedicated May 12, 1801. The Rev. Thomas Waterman was the first pastor. He was succeeded by the Rev. William Collier (B. U. 1797) in 1804. The parish was soon involved in pecuniary and other difficulties; and the meeting house, which Dr. Bartlett describes as "handsome and convenient, with a cupola and bell," passed out

exalted character caused him to be held in the highest esteem by all who knew him; and his excellent history of the church he so faithfully



served has placed this community, where he was known and loved and honored, under lasting obligation to its author. The pulpit is now vacant.

[1] Cf. *ante*, p. 553; Sprague, *Life of Jedediah Morse, D.D.*; Wyman, *Genealogies and Estates of Charlestown*, p. 680; Duyckinck, *Cyclopaedia of American Literature*, i. 161; and Dana, *Memoir of the Late Hon. Samuel Dana*, pp. 14, 15.

[2] [The Rev. Dr. James Freeman printed some rather damaging *Remarks* on this book in 1793, and its author curiously chose to consider the pamphlet a hidden attack on his Orthodoxy and a step towards turning Harvard College into a Unitarian institution! See Henry Stevens's *Hist. Coll.*, I., No. 224. Ed.]

[3] Cf. Hunnewell, *Bibliography of Charlestown, Mass., and Bunker Hill*. Boston: 1880, — a valuable compilation, — for a list of Dr. Morse's publications.

[4] Cf. Ellis, *Half-Century of the Unitarian Controversy*; Budington, *History of the First Church*, pp. 150–58; and Dexter, *The Congregationalism of the last Three Hundred Years*, pp. 612–26.

[5] The Old South was then the only Congregational Church in Boston which had not espoused the Unitarian faith. [See Dr. Tarbox's chapter in the present volume. — Ed.]

of its hands. It was purchased in 1816 by the Unitarians.[1] The Baptists, in 1810, built another meeting-house on the site of their present edifice on Austin Street.[2] In 1811 there was another and larger secession from the First Parish to form the First Universalist Society, which built a meeting-house on the site it has ever since occupied.[3] The Rev. Abner Kneeland was its first minister. The Rev. Charles Follen Lee is the present pastor.[4]

In 1815 the greatest secession in the history of the First Parish occurred. The Unitarians who withdrew at that time held their first meeting, Dec. 28, 1815, in Massachusetts Hall in the Indian Chief Tavern,[5] the Hon. Josiah Bartlett presiding. It was voted to apply to the Legislature for an act of incorporation as the Second Congregational Society in Charlestown.[6] An act was granted, Feb. 9, 1816, in which General Austin's name appears first in the list of corporators. Mr. Thomas Prentiss (H. C. 1811), a classmate of Edward Everett and Chief-Justices Dunkin and Lane, was ordained its first pastor, March 26, 1817. He died Oct. 5, 1817, in his twenty-fifth year. He was succeeded by Mr. James Walker (H. C. 1814), whose ordination occurred April 15, 1818. Dr. Walker resigned his pastorate, Feb. 18, 1839, having been called to the Alford Professorship of Natural Religion, Moral Philosophy, and Civil Polity, in Harvard College,[7] from which he passed to the presidency of that institution, in 1853.[8] He preached his farewell





[1] Cf. Edes, *History of the Harvard Church in Charlestown*, pp. 60–63, 81–88.

[2] Their pulpit is now vacant. Cf. *A Short History of the First Baptist Church in Charlestown.* Boston: 1852; and *Christian Watchman* (newspaper) for Jan. 4, 1828.

[3] In Church Court, contiguous to Thompson Square which was formed, in part, a few years ago, by cutting off the triangular building then standing at the northerly junction of Main and Warren streets, long known as "Crafts' Corner."

[4] [See Dr. Miner's chapter in the present volume. — ED.]

[5] This was formerly the mansion of Colonel David Wood, Jr., a prominent citizen, who was



a delegate to the Concord Convention of July, 1779, selectman, member of the school committee, fireward, etc. He was chosen representative in 1780, but declined serving. He was a director of the Charles River Bridge corporation. His daughter Ruth married the eldest son of Judge Gorham, in 1794 (see p. 549, *note*). The present meeting-house of the society, by a remarkable coincidence, stands upon the site of Massachusetts Hall, on Main Street. Colonel Wood's mansion stood between his father's — now known as the Edes Mansion (see p. 553, and *note*) — on the north, and the Hon. Samuel Dexter's (see p. 557, *note*), on the south. Judge Artemas Ward (H. C. 1783), LL.D., lived nearly opposite Mr. Dexter, on Main Street, — his estate being next above the northerly corner of Union Street.

There is a tradition that Colonel Wood's mansion was built before the Revolution; that it escaped the flames June 17, 1775; and that it was occupied during the Siege of Boston by the British Commissary, Jeremiah Dummer Rogers (H. C. 1762). The building is still standing on the northerly corner of Main and Miller streets, whither it was removed in 1818; after which it was known as the Eagle Hotel. Cf. Sabine, *Loyalists of the American Revolution*, ii. 232.

[6] Its name was changed to the New Church in Charlestown in 1819, and to the Harvard Church in Charlestown in 1837.

[7] Cf. *ante*, II. 318, *note*.

[8] Dr. Walker was officially connected with the college as overseer, fellow, or president, from 1825 till 1860, and from 1864 till his death, Dec. 23, 1874. He was also a Fellow of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences. During his residence here he was President of the Trustees of the Charlestown Free Schools.

sermon July 14, 1839. During his ministry the present meeting-house was built. It was dedicated Feb. 10, 1819. Dr. Walker was succeeded by Mr. George Edward Ellis (H. C. 1833), who was ordained March 11, 1840. His ministry was signalized by the establishment of the Free Ministry and the building of the Harvard Chapel on Edgeworth Street (1846–56), for nearly twenty years (1850–69) in charge of the Rev. Oliver Capen Everett (H. C. 1832). He was professor of Systematic Theology in the Divinity School at Cambridge, 1857–63. He delivered his farewell discourse June 13, 1869. His ministry and that of his distinguished predecessor covered more than half a century (1818–69).[1] The Rev. Charles Edward Grinnell (H. C. 1862) was installed his successor, Nov. 10, 1869, and he retired from his charge Dec. 28, 1873. The society was without a settled minister till Oct. 4, 1876, when its present pastor, the Rev. Pitt Dillingham (D. C. 1873), was ordained.[2]

Feb. 15, 1820, the trustees of the Methodist Religious Society in Charlestown were incorporated. They purchased and occupied the meeting-house on High Street, which had belonged successively to the Baptists and Unitarians. The Rev. Dr. Wilbur Fisk (B. U. 1815), afterward President of Wesleyan University, was their first minister. The society, known since June, 1862, as the Trinity Society of the Methodist Episcopal Church, now worships in a large brick meeting-house on High Street, opposite the head of Elm Street.[3] March 1, 1833, the Legislature incorporated the Winthrop Society in Charlestown. This society, Orthodox in belief, was formed by a secession from the First Parish. It worshipped for a time in the Town Hall until a meeting-house could be built for it on the southerly side of Union Street. In 1849 the present commodious building on Green Street was completed. The Rev. Daniel Crosby (Y. C. 1823) was the first minister. The present pastor is the Rev. Alexander Stevenson Twombly (Y. C. 1854). The other religious societies are: St. John's Church (Episcopal), organized March 7, 1840, of which the Rev. Dr. Thomas R. Lambert is the present rector; the Bunker Hill Baptist Church,[4] the pulpit of which is now vacant; the Monument Square Methodist Episcopal Church,[5] the Rev. Dr. James O.

[1] June 17, 1841, Dr. Ellis delivered here an oration, in which Prescott's right to be regarded as the commander in the battle of Bunker Hill was ably set forth. Forty years later it was his privilege to offer for the acceptance of the Bunker Hill Monument Association the noble statue of Prescott, to be mentioned presently. To Dr. Ellis's active interest the public is chiefly indebted for one of the best pedestrian statues in America. Cf. *Proceedings of the Bunker Hill Monument Association* for 1881.

[2] A *History of the Harvard Church in Charlestown*, 1815–1879, octavo, pp 294, by the writer of this chapter, was "printed for the society" in 1879. It contains full biographical notices of all the pastors and nearly complete lists of their several publications.

[3] The Rev. Dr. Henry White Warren (Wesleyan Univ. 1853), now one of the bishops of the M. E. Church, was pastor of this society, 1868–70. Its present pastor is the Rev. Dr. Horace W. Bolton.

[4] In 1844, 222 persons were dismissed from the First Baptist Church to form another society, now defunct, which worshipped in a small wooden meeting-house that occupied a part of the site of the present Trinity (Methodist) Society on High Street. By some of those persons the present Bunker Hill Baptist Church was organized, Jan. 5, 1850, as the Bethesda Baptist Society.

[5] This society, formerly known as the Union Church, dates from 1847. Its first settled pastor was the Rev. Edward Cook.

Knowles, pastor; St. Mary's Church (Roman Catholic), opened for public worship in May, 1829, the Very Rev. William Byrne, V.G., pastor; and the Church of St. Francis de Sales (Roman Catholic), dedicated June 17, 1862, now under the charge of the Rev. Michael J. Supple.[1]

The burning of the Ursuline Convent on Mount Benedict by a mob from Boston, on the night of Aug. 11, 1834, is described in other chapters.[2] The next day a town-meeting was held to take notice of the outrage, and a committee, consisting of the Hon. Edward Everett,[3] Benjamin Whipple, John Soley, John Skinner, and the Hon. William Austin[4] was chosen to prepare resolutions expressing the indignation of the citizens at the lawless proceedings on the previous night. The resolutions were adopted, and a vigilance committee, consisting of General Austin and nine others, appointed "to take all such measures as may be necessary to preserve the public peace," and to detect and bring to justice the perpetrators of the deed. The town directed the selectmen to offer a reward for the detection of the culprits, and voted to request the Governor of the Commonwealth to offer an additional reward.

Questions of public policy have never been more earnestly or more warmly debated in any community than in this. In August, 1793, the town replied to a letter from the Hon. Thomas Russell,[5] as chairman of a committee of the town of Boston, expressing its sense of the impropriety of fitting out armed vessels to cruise against the mercantile marine of other nations at peace with the United States, and its opinion that such an act constituted a breach of neutrality; and, further, that participants in such acts should be regarded as enemies of the country. In 1795 (July 21), the town having listened to the reading of Jay's treaty, voted to "disapprove of the treaty now pending between the United States and Great Britain;" and "that this town do disapprove of



[1] Cf. the several chapters on the different denominations in the present volume.

[2] See those by the Very Rev. William Byrne, V.G., which contains a view of the convent, and by James M. Bugbee, in the present volume.

[3] Mr. Everett lived in Charlestown, 1828–37, chiefly while representing the Middlesex District in the Congress of the United States.

[4] The Hon. William Austin (H. C. 1798) was a younger brother of General Austin (see p. 555, *note*). He was a college classmate of the Rev. Dr. William Ellery Channing and Mr. Justice Story; declined to accept membership in the Phi Beta Kappa, to which he was elected, because it was then a secret society; studied law about two years in London, entering at Lincoln's Inn; and after his return home became a prominent member of the Middlesex Bar. He was representative and State senator, and a graceful and vigorous writer. Five of his sons graduated at Cambridge — in 1825, 1830, 1831, 1839 (H. D. A.), and 1849; and his daughter Margaret married William Prescott Dexter (H. C. 1838), a grandson of the Hon. Samuel Dexter (see p. 557 and *note*). Mr. Austin died here June 27, 1841, aged 63. Cf. Allibone, *Dictionary of Authors*, i. 83; Duyckinck, *Cyclopædia of American Literature*, i. 658, 659; Willard, *Memories of Youth and Manhood*, ii. 13–15, 39, 165; Loring, *The Hundred Boston Orators*, pp. 328, 329; and Wyman, *Genealogies and Estates of Charlestown*, p. 33.

[5] He was a son of the Hon. James Russell (*ante* II. 330). Cf. Rev. Dr. Peter Thacher's *Sermon*, April 17, 1796; Dr. John Warren's *Eulogy*, May 4, 1796; and Wyman, *Genealogies and Estates of Charlestown*, p. 834.

the treaty as modified by the Senate of the United States." The selectmen, as instructed, communicated these votes to the President the next day. Washington replied August 31.[1]

July 20, 1807, resolutions were passed condemning the attack of the "Leopard" upon the "Chesapeake,"[2] and approving the then recently issued proclamation of the President. Aug. 20, 1808, the selectmen received a letter from the selectmen of Boston concerning the proceedings of that town with respect to the embargo,[3] and requesting that similar measures might be adopted by this town; but the receivers of the letter, being of a different political complexion from their Boston brethren, deemed it inexpedient to convene the town to consider the letter, and sent of themselves a reply.[4] Jan. 29, 1847, a town-meeting, convened in pursuance of a warrant signed by Jacob Foss, a justice of the peace, — the selectmen refusing to issue a precept, — appropriated fifteen hundred dollars "to fit out the company of volunteers raised in" Charlestown "who are about to embark for the seat of war," — the Mexican. The selectmen (January 23) in refusing the prayer of Mr. Foss and others, expressed the opinion "that the town would have no authority to make such an appropriation as the petitioners contemplate."

The war for the Union found here the most cordial sympathy and support. The amount of money appropriated and expended on account of the war and for aid to soldiers' families, less the amount refunded by the Commonwealth, was $176,000. The city furnished for that struggle four thousand three hundred and seven men, a surplus of one hundred and eleven over all requisitions. One hundred and twenty-three of these were commissioned officers. Seven complete organizations, of which the officers and nearly all the enlisted men resided in Charlestown, constituted her nominal contribution to the national armies; but there were numerous enlistments of Charlestown men in other organizations credited to other places, besides more numerous enlistments in the navy, of which no sufficient data are at hand.[5] The Bunker Hill Soldiers' Relief Society,[6] which was the first of its kind organized in the loyal States, had its inception in the mind of Miss Almena Brodhead Bates, through whose active interest a meeting of ladies was held for consultation at the residence of her father, the late Paymaster John Adams Bates, U. S. N., on Saturday evening, April

[1] Both letters are recorded in the Town Records, ix. 387, 388. See Mr. Lodge's chapter in the present volume.

[2] Cf. Lossing, *Pictorial Field Book of the War of 1812*, p. 156 *et seq.*

[3] Cf. Mr. Lodge's chapter in this volume.

[4] Recorded in Town Records, x. 117–19.

[5] For the facts in this paragraph I am under obligation to Major William H. Hodgkins who has kindly placed at my disposal his valuable collection of statistics concerning Charlestown in the Civil War. Cf. Robinson, *History of the Fifth Regiment, M. V. M.*; *Record of the Mass. Volunteers*, 1861–65, published by the Adjutant-General in two vols., quarto; and the *Charlestown Advertiser* (newspaper), 1861–66. The Soldier's and Sailor's Monument, by Millmore, stands on the Training-field. It was dedicated June 17, 1872. The Grand Army of the Republic is represented here by Abraham Lincoln Post No. 11, and George L. Stearns Post No. 140. Charlestown is also well represented in the Military Order of the Loyal Legion of the United States.

[6] The devotion of the late Miss Louisa Bray to the work of this society throughout its entire existence, was remarkable.

20, 1861. The Hon. Richard Frothingham[1] presided. A Constitution was agreed upon, which was adopted by the largest meeting of ladies ever held in Charlestown, in City Hall, on the following Monday afternoon, when a board of officers was elected.[2] The beneficent work of this society was zealously carried on till the close of the war by the ladies of Charlestown. Its annual expenditures amounted to between $4,000 and $5,000, which was raised by the churches, by individual contributions, and by entertainments given for its benefit.



In 1823 measures were taken by Mr. Webster, Judge Tudor, Theodore Lyman, Jr., Colonel Thomas H. Perkins, General Dearborn, and other prominent gentlemen, to form an association for erecting a monument on Bunker Hill. An act incorporating the Bunker Hill Monument Association was passed June 7, 1823; and Governor John Brooks was chosen its first president, June 17. Plans were soon matured to raise the funds necessary to buy the site of the battle-field on Breed's Hill (which had been secured by Dr. John C. Warren) and to build the monument.[3] On the fiftieth anniversary of the battle, the corner-stone of the obelisk was laid with masonic ceremonies in the presence of La Fayette,[4] and an oration pronounced by Mr. Webster, who was also the orator at the completion of the monument in 1843.[5] In 1857 a marble statue, by Dexter, of General Joseph Warren was placed upon the grounds; and the present year has witnessed the unveiling of Story's admirable statue, in bronze, of Colonel William Prescott.[6]

[1] Mr. Frothingham was born here Jan. 31, 1812, and died here Jan. 29, 1880. He was a trustee of the schools as early as 1839; was representative in 1840 and subsequent years; and mayor 1851–53. He was a political writer, as well as the author of several historical works, which are authorities upon the subjects they treat. His *History of Charlestown*, from 1629 to 1775, appeared in seven numbers (1845–49). Harvard College conferred on him the degree of A.M. in 1858, and Tufts that of LL.D. in 1874.

Mr. Thomas Bellows Wyman was born in Charlestown Dec. 11, 1817, and died here May 19, 1878. He was cousin to Mr. Frothingham, but, unlike him, he never held any public office. His quiet and retired life was chiefly devoted to the preparation of his unique and unrivalled work, *The Genealogies and Estates of Charlestown*, which entitles him to a respectful and grateful recognition in these volumes.



[2] Cf. Schouler, *Massachusetts in the Civil War*, ii. 393–99, for a full account of this society and its officers.



[3] The obelisk is about two hundred and twenty feet high. The architect was Solomon Willard. In 1824 the town declined the overtures of the Association for the cession to it of the Training-field, on condition that a more spacious park should be laid out on Breed's Hill.

[4] General La Fayette was received here the preceding year (Aug. 27, 1824) by a large committee of the town, which had specially invited him to be its guest. Cf. Town Records, xi. 213, 214; and *Mass. Hist. Soc. Proc.* xiv. 65–67.

[5] Cf. Frothingham, *History of the Siege of Boston*, pp. 337–59; and Warren, *History of the Bunker Hill Monument Association*.

[6] See Mr. Arthur Dexter's chapter in Vol. IV.

In 1804 a statement of the town's expenses was ordered to be printed annually and distributed among the citizens. In 1804–5 the State Prison was built at Lynde's Point.[1] The original building, to which others subsequently were added at different times, was of granite, two hundred feet long by forty feet wide, and four stories high. The buildings are no longer used as a penitentiary, the institution having been recently removed to Concord.[2] In 1805–1807 the new burial-ground on Bunker Hill Street[3] was laid out. In 1812 a Branch of the Washington Benevolent Society was established here. In 1813 the Washington Hall Association was incorporated. In August, 1815, it was voted to light lamps in certain streets, not named, at "the dark of the moon in October next." July 5, 1817, President Monroe was received by a large committee of prominent citizens of which the Hon. Josiah Bartlett was chairman.[4] Oct. 6, 1818, the McLean Asylum for the Insane[5] was opened. June 18, 1825, the Bunker Hill Bank was chartered; and Feb. 21, 1829, the Warren Institution for Savings was incorporated. In November, 1829, the town dismissed the petition of John H. Shaffer for the erection of a theatre; and the following month the use of the Town Hall was granted to the Charlestown Lyceum, which was opened with an address by Major Walker, Jan. 5, 1830. Lyceum Hall was incorporated March 4, 1831.[6]



In 1802 the town was surveyed for the fourth time.[7] The same year Nathaniel Prentiss and others were set off from this town to Cambridge.[8] In 1824 the project of constituting as a separate town all that part of Charlestown which lay "without the Neck" was first seriously considered in town-

[1] Cf. *ante* I. 387.

[2] An excellent view (18 × 10½ inches) of the prison and workshops in 1829, drawn in India-ink and colors by a convict, is in possession of the writer of this chapter. There is a brief account of the prison, and a view of it from the water side, in Barber's *Hist. Coll. of Mass.*, pp. 367, 368. Cf. *An account of the Massachusetts State Prison*, Charlestown, 1806; G. Bradford, *Description and Historical Sketch*, 1816; G. Haynes, *Historical Sketch*, 1869; and Bartlett, *Historical Sketch of Charlestown*, p. 175.

[3] A Roman Catholic burial-ground, on the summit of Bunker Hill, contiguous to St. Francis de Sales' Church, was consecrated later.

[4] Dr. Bartlett's address of welcome, and the President's reply, are in the Town Records (xi. 53, 54). President Jackson visited Charlestown, by invitation, June 26, 1833. He was welcomed on Breed's Hill by Mr. Everett, who presented him with a mahogany box, suitably inscribed, containing a six-pound ball from the battle-field of New Orleans and a grape-shot from the field of Bunker Hill. Mr. Everett's address and the President's reply are in the Town Records (xii. 250–55). July 22, 1845, resolutions on the death of General Jackson were adopted. Cf. Town Records, xiv. 262, 263.

[5] Cf. *ante*. I. 391. There is a view and some account of the asylum in Barber's *Hist. Coll. of Mass.*, pp. 366, 367. Views engraved on steel may be found as frontispieces to Frothingham's *History of Charlestown* and Bowditch's *History of the Mass. General Hospital*, which see.

[6] This year (1831) the first Charlestown Directory appeared. Others followed in 1834, 1836, 1838, 1840, 1842, 1845, 1848, 1852, and then every two years till 1874, when the last of the series of twenty was issued. A complete set is in the Charlestown Branch of the Public Library.

[7] This survey is printed in the *Third Report of the Boston Record Commissioners*, pp. 247–62. Cf. *ante*, I. 393; II. 324.

[8] Cf. *ante*. II. 324.



TUFTS'S PLAN OF CHARLESTOWN, 1818.[1]

meeting.[2] The committee then appointed to confer with the persons desiring the separation, and to mature an acceptable plan, failed to accomplish its mission. In 1842, however, the town voted (Jan. 26) to accede to the petition of Guy C. Hawkins and others to be set off as the town, now city, of Somerville; and appointed a committee to confer with the legislative committee engaged in drafting the bill authorizing the separation concerning the

[1] Copies of this plan, taken from the original copperplate, were inserted in Volume II. of Wyman's *Genealogies and Estates of Charlestown.*

[2] A petition for such a separation, signed by Samuel Tufts and others, was then pending in the General Court.

lines of demarcation to be determined and the conditions attending the disruption. The act incorporating the new town was passed March 3. April 22, following, Charlestown was newly divided into six wards.[1]

Jan. 5, 1846, the town considered a petition of the Hon. Henry P. Fairbanks and others, that application be made to the General Court for a city charter. Nov. 9, 1846, the selectmen were authorized, by a vote of 798 to 774, to petition for a charter. One was granted Feb. 22, 1847, and accepted by the town March 10, — the vote standing 1127 in favor of the Act, and 868 against it. March 20 the selectmen divided the town into three wards, as provided in the charter. April 19, upon a second trial,[2] Mr. George W. Warren (H. C. 1830) was elected mayor.[3] The first board of aldermen consisted of Ebenezer Barker, Dexter Bowman, John Cheever, Thomas Hooper, Phinehas J. Stone, and Paul Willard (H. C. 1817).

The Public Library had its inception in the offer of the Hon. Timothy T. Sawyer, the Hon. Edward Lawrence, Mr. Edwin F. Adams, and Mr. Nathan A. Tufts, to give $500 each towards founding such an institution. It was established by a city ordinance, passed June 5, 1860. The library was opened Jan. 7, 1862, and was administered by trustees,[4] chosen annually, until it became a branch of the Boston Public Library, in 1874. It now contains more than twenty-two thousand volumes. Cornelius Sowle Cartée (B. U. 1825) has been the librarian since 1870.[5]

The Mystic Water Works were constructed under a legislative act, passed in March, 1861, which was accepted by the people Sept. 10, by a vote of 944 to 251. Dec. 10, 1861, Messrs. Edward Lawrence, Matthew Rice, and George H. Jacobs were appointed commissioners to build the works. They organized by choosing Mr. Lawrence chairman, Jan. 8, 1862. April 5, Mr. Charles L. Stevenson was appointed chief engineer, and Mr. George R. Baldwin,[6] consulting engineer. September 27, work was begun on the reservoir on Walnut Hill,[7] Somerville. The water was formally introduced into the city with imposing ceremonies, Nov. 29, 1864. The expenditures of the commissioners, who made their final report Feb. 28, 1865, amounted to $731,515.83. The Mystic Water Board was created the same year (1865), and continued to manage the water department until it was

[1] In 1841 the valuation of what is now Somerville amounted to $579,440, and of what remained after Somerville was set off, $4,008,680. Cf. Town Records, xiii. 366–69, 446–50; xiv. 35–37, 164–68. In 1847 the valuation was $8,415,145.

[2] A majority of the votes cast was then necessary to a choice.

[3] Mr. Warren's successors in the mayoralty were: Richard Frothingham, Jr., 1851–53; James Adams, 1854; Timothy T. Sawyer, 1855–57; James Dana (H. C. 1830), 1858–60; Horace G. Hutchins (D. C. 1835), 1861; Phinehas J. Stone, 1862–64; Charles Robinson, Jr., 1865–66; Liverus Hull, 1867–68; Eugene L. Norton, 1869; William H. Kent, 1870–72; and Jonathan Stone, 1873.

[4] The Hon. Timothy T. Sawyer was president of the board of trustees during the entire separate existence of the institution, to which his loyal and arduous service was conspicuous.

[5] The covenant between the city and the original subscribers was recognized in sect. 12 of the Annexation Act of 1873, which provides that all books and documents then belonging to the library, or thereafter given or bequeathed to it, "shall be continued and kept within the present limits of Charlestown." Its funds and future bequests to it were similarly secured.

[6] He was half brother to the Hon. Loammi Baldwin (H. C. 1800). See p. 557, *note*.

[7] Formerly called Walnut Tree Hill. Cf. *ante*, I. 391.

merged with the Cochituate Water Works in the Boston Water Board. The Hon. Edward Lawrence was chairman of the commissioners and of the water board from Jan. 8, 1862, till July 15, 1873, when he resigned. The ability with which he administered this important trust, for which he received no pecuniary compensation, was fitly recognized by the city council upon his retirement.[1] The total cost of the works to January, 1873, was $1,460,000. They yield a handsome revenue.[2]

The Winchester Home for Aged Women was founded by Mrs. Nancy (Phipps) Winchester,[3] who died here June 24, 1864, bequeathing an estate worth about $10,000 to establish "a home for aged and indigent females." The corporation was organized Oct. 3, 1865. The managers[4] are chosen by the different Protestant religious societies in Charlestown.

The annexation of Charlestown to Boston was brought before this town, on petition of Oliver Holden[5] and others, as early as Nov. 14, 1836, when the matter was "indefinitely postponed."[6] At a town-meeting held Jan. 28, 1845, a preamble and resolutions opposing the scheme, which had been revived, were presented by Mr. Richard Frothingham, Jr., and adopted. April 29, 1854, an act to unite the two cities was passed by the Legislature and accepted by the people; but it was set aside on account of a flaw in its provisions.[7] The measure was again agitated in 1860 and in 1870. On the fourteenth of May, 1873,[8] another act was passed. It was accepted by both cities on the first Tuesday in October; and on the first Monday in January, 1874, Charlestown cast in her lot with that of her first-born.



[1] Cf. Records of the Board of Mayor and Aldermen, x. 36, 37.

[2] Cf. *Report on supplying the city of Charlestown with pure water*, Dec. 26, 1859, by G. R. Baldwin and C. L. Stevenson, Boston, 1860; and *Report of the commissioners and chief engineer of the Charlestown Water Works*, Feb. 28, 1865. Boston: 1865.

[3] Cf. Wyman, *Genealogies and Estates of Charlestown*, p. 754.

[4] At the present time (1881) the Hon. Livernus Hull is President of the corporation, the Hon. Timothy Thompson Sawyer and the Hon. Francis Childs, are Vice-Presidents, Mr. John Turner is Treasurer, and Mr. Abram Edmands Cutter, Secretary.

[5] Mr. Holden was the composer of the tune "Coronation," in 1793. Cf. Wyman, *Genealogies and Estates of Charlestown*, p. 509.

[6] An earlier movement in the same direction occurred in 1829. Two informal meetings of the citizens were held in the Town Hall, March 20 and April 3 of that year. At the last meeting a report favoring the measure was presented. Only two speeches were made, — one by Mr. Joseph Tufts (H. C. 1807), the other by Mr. Arthur W. Austin (H. C. 1825), then a young attorney-at-law, who vigorously attacked the scheme, and succeeded in defeating it by a majority of ten to one. Cf. *Bunker Hill Aurora* (newspaper) for March 21 and April 4, 1829.

[7] The decision of the Supreme Judicial Court is reported in 2 Gray, 84.

[8] In 1873 the valuation was $35,289,682; and the public property was reckoned worth $3,035,100, including the water works which are set down at $2,000,000. The annual appropriations for the year 1873-74 amounted to $497,275. Jan. 12, 1874, the funded debt amounted to $2,623,287.50.

CHAPTER XVI.

ROXBURY IN THE LAST HUNDRED YEARS.

BY FRANCIS S. DRAKE.

AT the close of the Revolutionary war, and for nearly half a century afterward, Roxbury was still a suburban village, with a single narrow street, and dotted with farms, many of which were yet held by the descendants of original proprietors. Not a few of the old homesteads were still in existence, and the manners, habits, and pursuits of the primitive inhabitants had not wholly given place to newer fashions and more varied occupations. The business of the town was concentrated in Roxbury Street, the sole thoroughfare to Boston, through which, as through a tunnel, crowded all the surplus produce of the country. Hides and skins, the chief articles of its trade aside from its farm products, also supplied the staple for its manufactures of leather, shoes, and gloves. Traces of the siege were evident in the remains of forts and earthworks lining its eastern border, in the shot-riddled houses in their vicinity, and also in the absence of the shade and forest trees that had formerly adorned it. From the old Burying-ground to the site of the British lines[1] not a house was left standing.

The town at this period contained two hundred and thirteen dwelling-houses, eighteen tanneries and slaughter-houses, one chocolate mill, two grist mills (Pierpont's and Ralph Smith's), three meeting-houses, one grammar school, and four other schools. Its population was probably under two thousand. The eastern, central, and western portions, respectively known as the First Parish, Jamaica Plain, and Spring Street, constituted prior to 1820, when parochial divisions had all disappeared, the First, Second, and Third parishes. Punch-Bowl village was at Muddy River, now Brookline; Roxbury Precinct included the westerly side of Parker Hill and vicinity; and Pierpont's Village clustered around the mill whose site is now the Roxbury Station of the Boston and Providence Railroad.

Jamaica Plain, originally called the "Pond Plain," had, as early as 1667, received its present name, probably in compliment to Cromwell, and in commemoration of his recent valuable conquest from Spain of the island

[1] Canton Street

of Jamaica. This charming and healthful region has always been a favorite summer resort for Bostonians. Here were the country seats of Governors Bernard, Hancock, and Bowdoin, of Sir William Pepperrell the younger, Commodore Loring, Captain Hallowell, and many other distinguished citizens of colonial days, as well as those of a later period.

The localities embraced in the western portion of the town were Spring Street, so named for its springy character; Muddy Pond, with its aboriginal woods, bordering upon Dedham; Muddy-Pond Hill, lately re-christened "Mount Bellevue;" Canterbury, that quiet and obscure portion of the town adjoining Dorchester, whose name is a puzzle to the antiquary, and in which are now included the beautiful cemeteries of Forest Hills and Mount Hope; Brook Farm, the scene of the most famous of American Socialist experiments, lying in the southwest corner of the town; and the Bussey Farm, originally the Weld Farm, upon which stands the Bussey Institution, the Agricultural School of Harvard University. Roslindale and Clarendon Hills, centrally situated, are communities of recent origin and rapid growth.

Slight alterations were made in the Boston boundary-line by the legislative acts of 1836, 1838, and 1859. In 1857 a decision of the Supreme Court of Massachusetts, regarded by the people of Roxbury as a flagrant piece of injustice, deprived her of seventy-one acres of Back-bay land which had belonged to her from time immemorial, and declared it to be the property of the State. Much of this territory, formerly covered with water, has been reclaimed, and now constitutes the finest portion of the city. The Back-bay Park, with the exception of a small portion belonging to Brookline, is included in the Roxbury tract. In 1838 eighteen hundred acres of Newton, bounding upon Charles River, were set off to Roxbury. That part of the town lying between Muddy River and the Brook, its original boundary, was annexed to Brookline in 1844. In 1852 a portion of Dedham was annexed to the town of West Roxbury. The filling of Roxbury Canal, the extension of Swett Street and of East-Chester Park have slightly enlarged the area of the town on its eastern side.

Shays's Insurrection broke out in the fall of 1786. Roxbury, true to her military traditions, performed her part in its suppression, sending to the scene of operations Captain Spooner's artillery company, and an infantry company under Captain Moses Draper. The former, before marching, were addressed at the Old Meeting-house by Mr. Samuel Quincy. November 30, Roxbury sent a party of mounted volunteers on a secret expedition for the capture of some of the leading insurgents; but they returned without effecting their object. For the protection of the Court to be held at Cambridge a company of veterans belonging to the First Parish was organized under the command of Major-General Heath, with Captain Joseph Williams and Hon. John Read as lieutenants.

At the public celebration in Boston, Feb. 8, 1788, of the ratification of the Constitution of the United States, at which all the industrial arts were

represented, the farmers of Roxbury, with a plough and other implements of husbandry, led the procession.

President Washington, dressed in his old Continental uniform, and attended by his secretaries Colonel Lear and Major Jackson, made his last entry into Boston from the Roxbury line, Oct. 24, 1789, to revisit the scene of his first memorable achievement. He was saluted with a discharge of cannon from the Roxbury Artillery, under Captain Jonathan Warner, Colonel Tyler's troop of horse escorting him to the entrance of the town. His detention here of two hours, exposed to a raw northeast wind, gave him a severe cold. From the same cause a general distemper became prevalent, called the "Washington Influenza."[1]

A canal fifty feet in width, extending from the wharf at Lamb's-Dam Creek nearly to Eustis Street, just east of the Burying-ground, was built in 1795, the line between Boston and Roxbury passing through its centre. Its enterprising projectors — among whom were Ralph Smith, Dr. Thomas Williams, and Aaron and Charles Davis — proposed by this means to save two and a half miles of land carriage from the centre of Boston. General Heath's manuscript journal, under date of March 9, 1796, notes the fact that a large topsail schooner that day came up into the basin of the new canal, in "Lamb's Meadow." This canal, never a paying investment, long ago ceased to be of commercial importance, and has been recently filled up by the city.

In 1795 the Jamaica-Pond Aqueduct Company was incorporated. About forty-five miles of pipes, made of logs, were laid, the average daily supply of water being about four hundred thousand gallons; and, until the introduction of Cochituate water, it supplied some portions of the old city. The right to draw water from the pond, granted to certain citizens conditionally in 1698, was a frequent cause of litigation till 1851, when the Boston Water Board bought the right for $45,000. In 1856 the city sold it for $32,000 to the present corporation, on condition that they should not bring water into the city proper.

Colonel Joseph Dudley, in 1810, gave a portion of his patrimonial estate as a site for a town house. A two-story brick building was erected, and was so far completed in February, 1811, that a town-meeting was then held there. The use of the upper story was granted, in 1818, to the Norfolk Guards for an armory. A grammar-school was subsequently kept there. After 1846 it was known as the City Hall. Latterly used as a court-house, with cells for prisoners in its basement, it was demolished in 1873, to make room for the new Dudley-School building, when the heirs of Dudley were recompensed for the departure from the original conditions of the gift.

Prominent among the town officers of Roxbury for fidelity and length of service were Deacon Samuel Gridley, Dr. N. S. Prentiss, Joseph W. Tucker, Colonel Joseph Williams, Noah Perrin, Ebenezer Seaver, and Joseph W. Dudley.

[1] [See Mr. Lodge's chapter in the present volume. — Ed.]

In September, 1814, while the second war with England was in progress, the town voted unanimously to do, by manual labor, pecuniary contribution, and military service, whatever the Executive of the Commonwealth should require to put the State in a proper posture of defence "in the

H. Dearborn.[1]

present alarming condition of the country;" and placed upon its war committee the veteran General Henry Dearborn. Political sentiment in New England was violently hostile to the war, and John Lowell, Jr.'s pamphlet on "Madison's War," a powerful attack on the party in power, so exas-

[1] [This portrait of Gen. Dearborn, painted by Stuart in 1812, is now owned by Mr. H. G. R. Dearborn, his grandson. See Mason's *Stuart*, p. 170. The Dearborn house, in Roxbury, is shown in Lossing's *Field-book of the War of* 1812, p. 250, and in Drake's *Roxbury*, p. 327. — Ed.]

perated some of its supporters, that they threatened to burn Mr. Lowell's house in Roxbury. No attempt was made, however, to put the threat into execution.

The Boston and Roxbury Mill Corporation was chartered June 4, 1814, and in 1818 work was begun on the Mill-dam, or Western Avenue, the first of the artificial roads connecting the peninsula of Boston with the main land. For the construction of this road, one and a half miles in length, Irish laborers were for the first time expressly imported into this country. The stone used was from the Parker-Hill quarry. It was opened July 2, 1821, with a public parade, the addition of another avenue to Boston being considered a great event. So far as obtaining water-power was concerned the project was a failure; but the conversion of the submerged territory into dry land by the Boston Water-Power Company has resulted in the rapid growth of the city in that direction.

In August, 1824, on the occasion of the visit of General Lafayette to the United States as the guest of the nation, he was entertained by Governor Eustis, his old compatriot in the army, at his residence in Roxbury, — the Governor Shirley mansion.[1] The General was received by a cavalcade of citizens, the bells were rung, while salvos of artillery and a discharge of rockets evinced the general enthusiasm and the heartiness of his welcome. A grand entertainment was given him by the Governor, at which were present ex-Governor Brooks and General Dearborn, both of whom had served with distinction in the Revolutionary army. After making a tour through the States, Lafayette returned to Roxbury, where he passed the night of June 16, 1825, and the next morning was escorted to Bunker Hill, where he assisted in laying the corner-stone of the monument.

The two hundredth anniversary of the settlement of Roxbury was celebrated Oct. 8, 1830, with great parade. Upon the square near the Norfolk House a procession was formed, which, under escort of the Norfolk Guards, marched through the principal streets. An historical address was delivered by General H. A. S. Dearborn, and a centennial poem by Dr. Thomas Gray. In the evening the town was illuminated by bonfires and by fireworks from

[1] [This is shown in the frontispiece of Vol. II. This mansion passed in 1764 into the hands of Judge Eliakim Hutchinson, Shirley's son-in-law; and as the judge was a loyalist, it was occupied by troops during the siege, and became in 1782 the property of the Hon. John Read, who sold it in 1791 to a French Refugee, Mme. de Fitzpatrick. Later, it was owned by Giles Alexander, and at one time was occupied by M. Dubuque, from Martinique, who had a cook named Julien, who afterward became famous in Boston as a caterer. Captain James Magee, a shipmaster in Colonel Thomas H. Perkins's employ, next owned it, and his widow sold it to Governor Eustis in August, 1819; and after the death of the governor's widow, who had kept the house unchanged, it was sold in August, 1867; and when Shirley Street was laid out the house was moved a little to the southeast. (Drake, *Town of Roxbury.*) In November, 1865, an auction sale of many relics preserved in the



old mansion took place, — such as a secretary given by General Warren to Governor Eustis; the furniture of the chamber occupied by Lafayette; a portrait on ivory of the Duchess of Orleans, given by herself to the governor; and the old family coach, which was built by Knowles and Thayer, of Amherst, in 1822 (sold for $3), and which has since been conspicuous in more than one procession in Boston. — ED.]

the Old Fort.[1] Another celebration, under the auspices of the Roxbury City Guard, took place November 22 of the centennial year 1876, at which General Horace B. Sargent was the orator.

The decade from 1820 to 1830 marks distinctly the epoch of transition from the old to the new town. Prior to this the only public improvement of magnitude besides the Roxbury Canal had been the construction, in 1805, of the Dedham Turnpike. The Mill-dam, as already noted, and two new churches, had been built in 1821. In 1824 Roxbury Street was paved and brick sidewalks laid. Before this the street was paved in the middle only, the sidewalk of cobble-stones having a narrow brick-walk in its centre. In 1825 all the existing roads, to the number of forty, received names from the town authorities. Albany Street, originally the "way to the town landing," or wharf, was widened, and named Davis Street. The Norfolk House was opened, and a newspaper started. The streets were first lighted in May, 1826, lamps being provided by the inhabitants. In this year hourly coaches began to run from the Town House to the Old South Church, in Boston; more frequent and rapid conveyance is now furnished by two steam and two horse railroads. The first of these, the Boston & Providence, was built in 1834. In 1829 a Board of Health was created.

In this and the following decade the march of improvement was further manifested by the speculative purchase of a number of the old estates near the business part of the town. Among the more important of these were the estates of Dr. Thomas Williams, between Albany and Magazine streets; the White Farm, in the locality since known as Mount Pleasant; the Weld and John Read estates, adjoining White's; the Dudley estate, lying between Bartlett and Roxbury streets; the Maccarty Farm, between Hawthorne Street and Walnut Avenue, and extending from Cedar Street on the north to Marcella Street on the south; the Ruggles and Joseph Williams estates, embracing the territory through which Highland and Cedar streets run; and the Lowell and Heath estates, on the north side of Centre Street, between it and Parker Hill. Through these large tracts streets were laid out and graded, new buildings very soon sprang up on every side, and the population and business of the town rapidly increased.

Tremont Street was opened to Roxbury from its Boston terminus, near Chickering's piano-forte factory, Sept. 10, 1832, — a great relief to Washington Street, which up to that period had been over-crowded with country teams. So much opposition was manifested to this enterprise by those doing business on the "Neck," then the only free thoroughfare connecting Boston with the country, — toll being taken on the Mill-dam, — that it could only be completed through private subscriptions. These were procured through the energetic efforts of Watson Gore and Guy Carleton, aided by John Parker and a few other wealthy men.

After more than two centuries of town government, which it had at length fairly outgrown, the town of Roxbury became a city, by legislative

[1] Where now the Cochituate stand-pipe is.

enactment, March 12, 1846. The act was accepted by the inhabitants on the twenty-fifth of the same month, eight hundred and thirty-six voting yea, while only one hundred and ninety-two voted in the negative. The old board of selectmen was replaced by a mayor, eight aldermen, and twenty-four councilmen. The territory of the town was divided into eight wards. When West Roxbury was set off, in 1851, it took parts of wards four and five, and all of wards six, seven, and eight, with the exception of Brook Farm, recently bought by the city for a poor-farm, and Forest Hills Ceme-

MEETING-HOUSE HILL IN 1790.[1]

tery, both within the territorial limits of the new town. One important result of the change was the immediate adoption of numerous much-needed public improvements, such as the general laying of sidewalks and drains, the construction of sewers, and the providing of public parks. One of the most memorable of the achievements of the new city government was the establishment of Forest Hills Cemetery. Gas was first introduced in 1850, and a horse-railroad was put in operation in 1856, running at first from Guild Row only to Boylston Street. Among the many street improvements was the widening of Washington Street, in 1855. In the twenty-two years of the city government the population grew from thirteen thousand to thirty thousand, its largest increase being in the decade from 1840 to

[1] [This follows a painting by Penniman, owned by Mr. Horace Hunt. It is taken from Deacon Moses Davis's house, and shows the old First Church. The Mears house, the Lambert house, and the old parsonage are yet standing. Drake, *Town of Roxbury*, p. 287. — Ed.]

1850; its business steadily expanded, and it became in all save the name a part of the adjoining metropolis. The following citizens successively occupied the mayor's chair: John Jones Clarke (1846), H. A. S. Dearborn (1847–51), Samuel Walker (1851–53), Linus Bacon Comins (1854), James Ritchie (1855), John Sherburne Sleeper (1856–58), Theodore Otis (1859–60), William Gaston (1861–62), George Lewis (1863–67).

The idea of dividing the town, which grew out naturally from its great extent, and from the fact that all its business, religious and secular, had to be transacted at its eastern extremity, first found expression in 1706, when petitioners to the General Court from that quarter of the town prayed that the western part might form a separate precinct. It accordingly became the second parish in 1711. An unsuccessful attempt was made in 1777 to incorporate the second and third parishes into a district to be called Washington. The western part of the town, being wholly agricultural, strongly objected to the expenditure of sums raised by general taxation upon improvements made almost wholly in the eastern or business part of the town. Efforts for separation were consequently renewed in 1817, again in 1838, 1843, and 1844, and finally in 1850, when they were successful, notwithstanding the opposition of the Roxbury city government,—the act setting off and incorporating West Roxbury taking effect May 24, 1851. This event, so interesting to its people, was celebrated with great rejoicings on the evening of June 3, 1851. The dividing line was Seaver Street, from Blue-Hill Avenue to Washington Street, thence, running in the same direction, to Brookline, crossing Centre Street at its junction with Day and Perkins streets. By this division Roxbury lost four-fifths of her territory, which was reduced to two thousand one hundred acres. Her population remained at fifteen thousand, the same as when she became a city. In 1868 West Roxbury built an elegant town house (Curtis Hall) on a portion of the Greenough estate.

Roxbury performed her whole duty in the war of the Rebellion, placing her entire quota promptly in the field. Spirited public meetings were held, stirring and patriotic addresses made, and there was no lack of effort to raise the men and material required of her for the preservation of the Union. At a meeting in West Roxbury in 1862, upon a proposition to lay out a new road, it was resolved that "the only road desirable to be laid out at the present time is the road to Richmond;" and the town gave $86,000 for war purposes, to which private subscriptions added $22,000. It is believed that Roxbury contributed more liberally to the support of the families of her soldiers than any other town in the State. The women were especially active in promoting the success of the Union cause. In December, 1861, they formed a society auxiliary to the United States Sanitary Commission; Mrs. Henry Bartlett was its president, and weekly meetings were held for nearly four years; they raised $7,860, and forwarded twelve thousand one hundred and eighty-three garments, besides linen, fruits, and hospital stores.

The city furnished three thousand two hundred and seventy-one men for

the service, one hundred and thirty-six of whom were commissioned officers, —a surplus of four hundred and forty. In consequence of her policy of raising her men in anticipation of the calls of the general government, she was subjected to but a single draft, and that a very slight one, in 1863. Valuable aid was rendered in procuring enlistments by the "Reserve Guard," Captain Edward Wyman. There was disbursed for war expenses $545,367.34, besides the sum of $21,818 in private subscriptions to aid in recruiting. The camp of the Second regiment, Colonel Gordon, was established at Brook Farm, May 11, 1861, and named Camp Andrew.

The Roxbury City Guard furnished three companies to the service, — Company D, First regiment, Captain Ebenezer W. Stone, Jr., for three years; and Company D, Forty-second regiment, Captain George Sherive, for nine months. This company made a part of Colonel Burrill's regiment, a portion of which was captured at Galveston, Texas, Jan. 1, 1863. Returning at the expiration of its term of service, it re-enlisted for one hundred days. Its officers remained prisoners until exchanged, July 22, 1864. Other Roxbury organizations for three years were—

Company E, Thirteenth regiment, Captain Joseph Colburn (promoted to lieut.-colonel).

Company E, Twenty-second regiment, Captain W. L. Cogswell.

Company K, Thirty-fifth regiment, Captain William S. King (promoted to colonel).

Company B, Thirty-ninth regiment, Captain William W. Graham (promoted to major).

Fifty-sixth regiment, Captain G. G. Redding (no distinct company organization).

Fifty-ninth regiment, Captain Lewis F. Munroe (killed Oct. 12, 1864).

Fifty-ninth regiment, Captain Warren S. Potter (no distinct company organization).

Of her officers, Colonels Isaac S. Burrill and W. Raymond Lee were captured at the outset of their periods of service,—the latter at Ball's Bluff. General Nelson A. Miles, well known for his distinguished services in the civil war, and in recent Indian campaigns, went from Roxbury as first lieutenant of company E, Twenty-second regiment. Among her brave sons whose lives were freely given to their country were General T. J. C. Amory, Colonel Lucius M. Sargent, and Major E. G. Park. Tasteful monuments to the memory of her fallen heroes have been erected at Forest Hills, and in front of the Unitarian church at Jamaica Plain.

The project of annexing Roxbury to Boston, broached in the year 1851, was for a long time strenuously opposed. Voted down in 1853 (two hundred and sixty-two yeas; nays, three hundred and ninety-nine), it was carried by the people in 1857 (eight hundred and eight to seven hundred and sixty-two); but in view of the small majority the city authorities declined to act upon it. In 1859 the legislature gave the petitioners leave to withdraw. In 1864 the proposition was rejected in the senate. At length the arguments of those who foresaw the necessity for a common system of streets, sewers, water-supply, and drainage for the two cities, already so

closely united commercially and geographically, prevailed. Early in 1867 a committee of the legislature unanimously reported that "the *benefits* to Roxbury, the *necessities* of Boston, and the *interests* of the Commonwealth, sanction and require annexation." The commissioners of both cities had previously reported in favor of the measure. It was accordingly adopted by the voters of the two cities on the second Monday of September, and annexation took effect Jan. 6, 1868. The vote of Roxbury was one thousand eight hundred and thirty-two to five hundred and ninety-two, — more than three to one in its favor. The majority of votes for it in Boston was also large. West Roxbury followed the example of her elder sister six years later (Jan. 5, 1874). By the annexation of these two districts Boston acquired a territory three times the size of her own, — a much needed accession; increased her valuation $26,551,700, and added forty thousand to her population. The especial benefit to Roxbury was the introduction of Cochituate water; a remarkable rise in the value of her real estate soon followed, and a fresh impetus was given to her growth and prosperity. Her history as a separate organization terminates at this point, after an existence of two hundred and thirty-eight years.

The past sixty years have witnessed a striking change in the religious life of Roxbury. The severity of the Puritan Sunday, which prevailed up to the close of the last century, had at the beginning of this period been materially relaxed, and fines for non-attendance at church were no longer exacted. The three churches which then sufficed for its religious wants have grown in number to forty-two; and the single denomination then in existence has seen springing up within and around it societies representing nearly all shades of religious belief, with full liberty for their exercise. Instead of the large number of clergymen in Roxbury at the present time, many of whom are little known, the three Roxbury ministers, Porter, Gray, and Bradford, for near half a century had wielded the spiritual destinies of the people, by whom they were universally known and greatly beloved. The old First Church, in Eliot Square, like so many others of the original churches of New England, is now Unitarian in its faith, the change taking place early in this century. Its present edifice, the fifth erected here, dates from 1804. In 1857 the building was repaired, and its interior greatly improved. At that time four of its pew-holders of 1804 were yet living, as also were twenty-five of the descendants of the original founders of 1632. It is noteworthy that the term of service of four of its ten pastors, — Eliot, Nehemiah Walter, Porter, and Putnam, — extends over a space of two hundred and nineteen years. With the exception of Welde, who went back to England, and the present pastor, all have begun and ended here their ministerial career, spending their lives in the service of this church. The Rev. Eliphalet Porter, D.D., pastor for more than half a century, was a sound, instructive, and practical, rather than a popular preacher, generally saying the right thing in the right manner, at the right time. His succes-

sor, the Rev. George Putnam, D.D., pastor for a nearly equal period, was a most thoughtful, interesting, and eloquent preacher. He represented Roxbury in the State Legislature and in the Constitutional Convention, and rendered efficient service to her schools.[1]

Next in age to the First Church is that of the Second Parish, also Unitarian, in West Roxbury. Its house of worship, on Centre Street near South, originally a plain, square structure, without a steeple, stood with its side to the road. Given its present form and largely rebuilt in 1821, it was again enlarged and repaired a few years ago. Theodore Parker, who preached here nearly nine years, speaks of his parishioners as "good, quiet, sober, church-going people, and capital listeners." For the first year or two, as he informs us in his volume of *Ministerial Experiences*, his congregation did not exceed seventy persons, including the children; yet he took great pains in the composition of his sermons, which were never out of his mind.

After Rev. Dr. Gordon's return to England, in 1786, the pastorate of the Third Parish Church, at Jamaica Plain, was vacant seven years, and until the settlement of the Rev. Thomas Gray. From a small and poor society Mr. Gray brought it to a highly prosperous condition. Though practical, agreeable, and often effective as a preacher, it was as a pastor, in the faithful and affectionate oversight of his flock, that his chief excellence lay. The present church edifice, erected about 1852, occupies the site of the first, which in 1820 had been enlarged and remodelled. In 1821 a new and larger bell replaced that given in 1783 by John Hancock, and formerly in the New Brick Church, Boston. This Church is also Unitarian Congregational.

A series of meetings held in the autumn of 1817, at the residence of Beza Tucker, continued in what was called "Whitewash Hall," in Guild Row, led to the formation of the Dudley-Street Baptist Church. The thickly-settled portion of the town had then but one religious society, that of the Rev. Dr. Porter. The first Baptist edifice, which was of wood, was raised May 10, 1820, and dedicated November 1; and March 9, 1821, the society, under the name of "The Baptist Church of Roxbury," was formed. Its present name was adopted Feb. 28, 1850; and its present building, erected in 1852, was dedicated July 27, 1853.[2]

The First Universalist Society in Roxbury originated in 1818, in a course of Sunday-evening lectures at the Town Hall by the Rev. Hosea Ballou, assisted by the Rev. Paul Dean. Beginning its career at about the same time as the Baptist church, it was, like that, made up largely of seceders from the Old First Church.[3]

St. James's Church, on St. James Street, the first Episcopal church in Roxbury, originated in May, 1832, and was incorporated in 1833. The parish was organized Aug. 9, 1832. Prior to the consecration of its

[1] [The succession of pastors of the churches in Roxbury can be found, when not given in this chapter, in those in this volume relating to the several denominations. — Ed.]

[2] Its pastors have been: Joseph Elliot (1822–24), William Leverett (1825–39), Thomas Ford Caldicott (1840–48), Thomas Davis Anderson (1848–61), Henry Melville King (1863 —).

[3] [Its history is told in Dr. Miner's chapter in this volume. — Ed.]

church building, by Bishop Griswold, Aug. 7, 1834, services were held weekly in the Female High-School house on Bartlett Street. The church was enlarged by the addition of a wing on the west side in 1862; a new chapel was built in 1877–78.[1]

The Eliot Congregational Church, in Kenilworth Street, an off-shoot of the Old First Church, was organized Sept. 18, 1834. Until the completion and dedication of its edifice, Nov. 25, 1835, services were held at the Town Hall, the Rev. Jacob Abbott officiating.

The Winthrop-Street Methodist Episcopal Society, incorporated in 1859, had its beginning in 1838, holding its meetings in a hall in Guild Row and at the Town Hall, until the completion, in December, 1840, of their house in Williams Street, now Shawmut Avenue. In August, 1852, they sold this property, and took possession of the house on Warren Street formerly occupied by the Baptist society, and which they caused to be removed to the site now occupied by the Warren Block. This house was destroyed by fire early in the morning of March 29, 1868. Services were held in the Universalist church until the completion of their present edifice on Winthrop Street, the first service being held there July 4, 1869. The new building was dedicated Nov. 28, 1869. A division of the society having in the meantime occurred, ninety members withdrew and formed the Highland Methodist Society, whose house of worship is at 160 Warren Street.

The Mount Pleasant Unitarian Church, on Dudley Street, is another off-shoot from the Old First Church in Eliot Square. The society was organized May 6, 1845, and its house, built on the site of the old Welde homestead, was dedicated in the following year.

St. Joseph's (Roman Catholic) church, on Circuit Street, was built in 1846. Of the forty-two places of worship at present in Roxbury, eight are Methodist Episcopal, seven Trinitarian Congregational, six Baptist, six Roman Catholic, four Unitarian Congregational, three Episcopal, three Universalist, and two Union. There are one each of the Lutheran, Swedenborgian, and Second Advent denominations.

In 1790 the number of pupils in the five town schools was two hundred and twenty-five. A new school-house was built in 1798 on what is now Palmer Street, and two others were soon afterward established at Canterbury. Nine school districts were formed in 1807, four of them in the easterly parish; and the total expenditure for schools increased from $1,000 to $1,500. The yearly cost of education was less than four dollars per scholar. In 1816 the appropriation was increased to $2,000, and uniformity in rules and regulations, and also in text-books, was secured. In 1829 committees were formed for visiting the schools at convenient times and without ceremony. In 1831 the upper part of the Town House was fitted up for pupils

[1] Its pastors have been: A. D. W. Howe (1832–35), William Staunton (1835–37), A. D. W. Howe (1837–46), Robert B. Hall (1846–47), John Wayland (1848–58), George S. Converse (1859–71), Percy Browne (1872—). See the chapter by the Rev. Phillips Brooks, D.D.

of both sexes above the age of seven years, and the appropriation increased to $3,000, — a little less than sixty cents *per capita* for each inhabitant. At this time there were eleven primary schools. In 1846, when the city was incorporated, there were six grammar and thirteen primary schools. The old grammar-school building, erected in 1742 and enlarged in 1820, having become totally inadequate to the requirements of the school, was sold in 1834, and a new one built in Mount-Vernon Place, now Kearsarge Avenue. In 1844, after a five years' experiment of making this a high school, its old organization was restored, such English studies only being required as are compatible with the latter character. Besides primaries, there are now two high schools and ten grammar schools in the Roxbury district. One of the most successful of its private schools was that established at Jamaica Plain by Stephen M. Weld, in 1827, and taught by him for a period of thirty years. Notre Dame Academy, a Roman Catholic institution, is on Washington, opposite Townsend, Street.

On the decease of Benjamin Bussey, in 1842, he bequeathed his valuable estate of three hundred acres to Harvard University, for the establishment of a seminary for "instruction in practical agriculture, useful and ornamental gardening, botany, and such other branches of natural science as may tend to promote a knowledge of practical agriculture and the various arts subservient thereto." Courses of lectures were also to be given. One half the net income is applied to maintain this institution; the residue is equally divided between the Divinity and Law schools of the University. The Bussey Institution, which includes the Arnold Arboretum, is on South (near Morton) Street, and went into operation in 1871. Its principal building is of Roxbury stone, in the modern Gothic style.

The first public library of Roxbury, established in 1805, reorganized as the "Social Library" in 1831, and as the "Roxbury Athenæum" in 1848, was incorporated in 1851, and is in Bradley's Building. Caleb Fellowes, founder of the Fellowes Athenæum, died in 1852, leaving $40,000 to be laid out for a suitable lot of ground, and in erecting thereon an edifice for an institution similar in plan to the Philadelphia Athenæum, while the income of a further bequest was to be applied to the purchase of books. It was incorporated in 1866, and having been joined by a covenant with the Roxbury Branch of the Boston Public Library, the united libraries were dedicated July 9, and opened for public use July 16, 1873.[1] A branch of the Public Library has also been established at Jamaica Plain. At Roslindale and at West Roxbury it has other less important dependencies.

The *Norfolk Gazette*, the first newspaper in Roxbury, was published weekly, by Allen & Weeks, from Dec. 15, 1824, to Feb. 6, 1827, when it

[1] A sufficient account of Mr. Fellowes and the Athenæum will be found in a pamphlet commemorating the dedication in 1873.

was discontinued. The *Norfolk County Journal*, now the *Home Journal*, also a weekly, was established in 1849, and was edited for two years by William A. Crafts. The *Roxbury City Gazette* was established by William H. Hutchinson in 1861. The *Suburban News*, a weekly, issued at Jamaica Plain, is now in its ninth year.

The old almshouse on Centre Street was abandoned in 1831, and a much larger one built on Marcella Street. In 1849 the Brook-Farm property was bought for a poor-farm by the city, but it was soon afterward sold. The Marcella-Street property is now a home for Boston's vagrant boys, while a portion of the city poor are kept at the Austin Farm Alms-house, in West Roxbury. There is a small-pox hospital at Canterbury.

In March, 1784, the Roxbury Artillery Company was formed, and John Jones Spooner, afterward an Episcopal clergyman, was chosen captain. This corps, which did good service in Shays's Rebellion, became an infantry company in 1857, taking its present name, — "The Roxbury City Guard." Its first parade was on July 5, 1784. The Norfolk Guards were organized Jan. 27, 1818, Alexander H. Gibbs commander; reorganized in 1838, and disbanded in 1855. This company, composed of prominent citizens, was highly distinguished for its bearing and efficiency. The Roxbury Horse Guards, Captain A. D. Hodges, organized May 16, 1861, re-organized in 1864, now forms a part of the active volunteer militia of the State.

The Fire Department of Roxbury has always been remarkable for its promptitude, skill, and efficiency. In 1784 its first fire-engine was located in Roxbury Street, opposite Vernon, the site of the Greyhound Tavern. Daniel Munroe was its captain; William Bosson, Jr., clerk and treasurer. Its members were John Swift, David Swift, John Williams, Jr., Elijah Weld, Joseph Weld, Joseph Richardson, William Dorr, Joshua Felton, Amos Smith, Aaron Willard, Abel Hutchins, Captain Samuel Mellish, Ensign R. H. Greaton, Jeremiah Gore, Jesse Doggett, and William Blaney. Fire wards were also chosen. A new fire-engine was established in 1787 near the Punch-Bowl Tavern. The members of this company were John Ward, Isaac Davis, Joseph Davenport, Joseph Crehore, James Pierce, Samuel Barry, Captain Belcher Hancock, and Lieutenant William Bosson. In 1802 the "Torrent" No. 2 was accepted, and its company of twenty-one men appointed. A new engine was purchased by subscription in 1819 for No. 1, and the town was asked for land on the northerly corner of the burying-ground on which to build its house. In 1831 Roxbury had seven fire-engines, with four hose-reels attached,—No. 1, Dudley Street (new house); No. 2, Centre Street, by Poor-House; Nos. 3 and 4, Jamaica Plain; No. 5, Spring Street; No. 6, Eustis Street (new house); No. 7, "Norfolk," at Punch-Bowl Village.

The Roxbury Charitable Society, formed in September, 1794, principally by members of the Roxbury Fire Society, was incorporated in 1799, and still continues its career of active beneficence. Judge Lowell was its first president. Among its promoters were Governor Sumner, Hon. John Lowell, Hon. John Read, William Lambert, the Rev. Eliphalet Porter, Hon. Sherman Leland, and Charles Davis. Imposing ceremonies in times past attended its anniversaries, such as a procession with military escort, and a discourse at the First Church. Among its anniversary orators were Judge Lowell, the Rev. Horace Holley, Edward Everett, Rev. Henry Ware, Dr. John Bartlett, and the Rev. E. D. Griffin. Prominent among the other charitable associations of Roxbury are the Consumptive's Home, Grove Hall; the Roxbury Home for Aged Women and Children, Copeland Street; the House of the Angel Guardian, Vernon Street; the House of the Good Shepherd, Tremont Street; Little Sisters of the Poor, Dudley Street; the Martin Luther Orphans' Home, Baker Street; St. Luke's Home for Convalescents, Roxbury Street; and the New England Hospital for Women and Children, on Codman Avenue.

The Washington Lodge of Freemasons, the thirteenth lodge chartered in Massachusetts, was instituted March 14, 1796, and Worshipful Master Ebenezer Seaver, Senior Deacon Simeon Pratt, and Junior Deacon John Ward were publicly installed by the Grand Master, Paul Revere, October 16. Its founders were Simeon Pratt, John Ward, Moses Harriman, Ebenezer Seaver, Timothy Healy, Joseph Ruggles, Stephen Davis, and James Howe. Among its past-masters were Simeon Pratt, Nathaniel Ruggles, Nathaniel S. Prentiss, Samuel Barry, Samuel J. Gardiner, John Howe, Charles Wild, and George Frost. The Mount Vernon Royal Arch Chapter, Lafayette Lodge, and the Joseph Warren Commandery of Knights Templars have since been organized in Roxbury. Odd Fellowship is represented here by the Warren Lodge, Highland Encampment, and Quinoboquin Lodge.

Brook Farm, one of the most celebrated of the former institutions of Roxbury, was purchased in 1841 by George Ripley and others, who associated themselves together as "The Brook-Farm Institute of Education and Agriculture," and were afterward incorporated as "The Brook-Farm Phalanx."[1] After occupying it for five or six years, they sold it to the city for a poor-farm. It is now "The Martin Luther Orphans' Home."

Apart from the old mansions and cemeteries of Roxbury, described in a former chapter, there are few memorials of her past in existence. Durable monuments of the beneficence of Judge Paul Dudley are yet visible in numerous mile-stones erected by him on the different roads leading from the town. One of the most prominent and interesting of these is a large stone at the corner of Centre Street, the old Dedham road; upon its front is inscribed, "The | Parting | Stone | 1744 | P. Dudley;" on its northerly side it directs to Cambridge and Watertown, and on its southerly side to Ded-

[1] [This social experiment will be described in a later chapter of Vol. IV. — Ed.]

ham and Rhode Island. Lord Percy's soldiers read its inscription as they passed it on their way to Lexington, one hot April forenoon; and it has since afforded rest and information to many a tired wayfarer. Not far from this, on the other side of the street, opposite the residence of Mr. Prang, is a still older stone, inscribed, "Boston 3 miles, 1729." At the corner of Eliot Street, Jamaica Plain, is another, inscribed, "Five miles to Boston Town House, 1735." Among the old houses not previously mentioned is the Crafts homestead on Tremont Street, near Parker-Hill Avenue, whose chimney bears date 1709. The Warren House, with its memorial inscriptions, and the Cochituate stand-pipe, and the adjacent monument, standing as they do on consecrated ground, call to mind the martyrs and patriots of '75. Among the landmarks still remembered, but which have disappeared, are the "Rocking-Stone," a natural curiosity situated on the Munroe Farm; and the tall chimney of the chemical works, near Hog Bridge, pronounced unsafe and taken down, after remaining a conspicuous landmark for over thirty years.

In 1846 General H. A. S. Dearborn and others petitioned the newly established city government of Roxbury for a rural cemetery. The purchase of the Joel Seaverns farm of fifty-five acres, in Canterbury, was the result; and to this the addition of other pieces of land adjoining have increased its area to two hundred and twenty-six acres. The work of laying out the grounds of this "Garden of the Dead" was assigned to General Dearborn, whose skill and taste had already been successfully exerted at Mount Auburn. The original wooden gateway, with its Egyptian designs, gave place in 1865 to the present tasteful structure of Roxbury stone and Caledonia freestone, in the modern Gothic style. At the left of the entrance is an elegant marble receiving-tomb, built in 1870. Three avenues diverge towards different parts of the cemetery from the main entrance, opposite which, on Snow-flake Hill, is a stone bell-tower and observatory one hundred feet in height, completed in 1876. The eminences which gave the cemetery its name are the Eliot Hills, a range of four heights in its south-western part; Consecration Hill, at its north-eastern angle; Chapel Hill, north of Lake Dell; the large hill south of Consecration Hill, named for the illustrious Warren; and Cypress Hill. Lake Hibiscus is near the centre of the cemetery, and is approached by avenues from its different parts. One of the most attractive spots at Forest Hills is the grotto on Dearborn Hill.

Mount Hope Cemetery, on Canterbury Street, a little south of Forest Hills, lies partly in Dorchester, and contains over one hundred acres. It was consecrated June 24, 1852, and July 31, 1857, its proprietors transferred it to the city of Boston. Other cemeteries in Roxbury are Mount Calvary, on Mount Hope Street; Gethsemane, Baker Street; Warren, Kearsarge Avenue; Hand-in-Hand (Jewish), Grove Street; Mount Benedict, Arnold Street; and St. Joseph's, Circuit Street.

Roxbury has several parks. Washington Park, the largest of these, lies between Bainbridge and Dale streets; Highland Park, on Fort Avenue, the

site of a Revolutionary fort, contains the Cochituate stand-pipe; Fountain Square, Orchard Park, and Madison Square are also parks of respectable dimensions. Cedar Square, on Cedar Street, was the gift of Alvah Kittredge, Esq., to the town. Other smaller breathing-spaces are Walnut, Walden, Bromley, and Lewis parks. Forest and Oakland gardens are popular and attractive summer resorts.

Salt was in the early days made at the "Salt Pans," near the town landing. Not far from this place General Joseph Palmer, conspicuous in the Revolutionary annals of the State, erected salt works, which were in successful operation when his sudden death, in 1788, brought the enterprise to a premature close. A fulling mill was established by John Pierpont on Stony River, near the site of Day's cordage factory, in 1658. The manufacture of leather was for a long time the principal one in Roxbury. Early in the present century, John Doggett founded the well-known looking-glass and carpet works on Roxbury Street. The Willards, celebrated clock and watch-makers for over a century, established themselves here in 1773.

In 1792 there were near the town landing-place, at Parker Street, several establishments, one of them owned by Ralph Smith, for the packing of provisions and the manufacture of soap and candles; and vessels were laden with these commodities here. Where Arlington Street now is the channel of approach was then, having nine feet of water at low tide. The Back Bay was at that time an expansive and beautiful sheet of water. The large establishment of the brothers Aaron and Charles Davis for packing provisions, and their distillery and tannery, were near the town wharf, now the junction of Albany and Northampton streets. In 1845 the value of Roxbury's manufactures, in which one thousand six hundred and sixty-eight persons were employed, was $2,247,684. The largest items embraced were four cordage manufactories, sixteen tanneries, three rolling, slitting, and nail mills, one carpet manufactory, nine bakeries, three chemical works, three starch mills, one distillery, five soap and tallow manufactories, and one lead manufactory. The manufacture of boots and shoes was a large item. The most notable of the varied industries of Roxbury at the present day is the chromolithographic manufactory of L. Prang & Co., on Roxbury Street, established in 1856. The Roxbury Carpet Company, and the Howard Watch and Clock Company are also well known for the excellence of their productions. There are seven large breweries in Roxbury.

According to the United States census, the population of Roxbury at different periods has been as follows (the figures for 1860 and 1870 do not include the population of West Roxbury): —

1790 . . . 2,226	1840 . . . 9,089	1870 . . . 34,772
1810 . . . 3,669	1850 . . . 18,373	1880 . . . 78,799
1830 . . . 5,247	1860 . . . 25,137	

Roxbury is the native place of three of the generals of the Revolution, — Warren, Heath, and Greaton; and the birthplace or home of ten of the governors of the State, — Thomas and Joseph Dudley, William Shirley, Francis Bernard, John Hancock, James Bowdoin, Samuel Adams, Increase Sumner, William Eustis, and William Gaston. Besides the names already mentioned, those of the following eminent citizens should be noted: General Henry Dearborn, and his son General Henry A. S. Dearborn; General William H. Sumner, and Admiral John A. Winslow of Kearsarge fame; Judge John Lowell, and his son John Lowell, Jr., a distinguished writer upon politics and agriculture; Samuel and Franklin Dexter, William Whiting and Sherman Leland, prominent lawyers; Hon. John Read, Ebenezer Seaver, and Ward Nicholas Boylston, valuable citizens; Jonathan Davies, Eliphalet Downer, John C. Warren, and John Bartlett, skilful physicians and noted men; Gilbert Stuart and Gilbert S. Newton his nephew, painters of celebrity; and S. G. Goodrich, Lucius Manlius Sargent, Samuel G. Drake, and Epes Sargent, who have acquired distinction in the field of literature.

The events of the siege of Boston are the only ones of much historical importance which have marked the annals of Roxbury, no serious conflagration or other grave public calamity having occurred within her borders. Her progress, owing to her geographical position and other favoring conditions, has been remarkably rapid of late years, and she must ere long contain within her ancient limits a large share of the city's population. The process of absorption and assimilation into the larger municipality is constantly going on, and is a matter of regret to those only whose local pride leads them to deplore the abdication of self-government and the lost identity of the old town, and who fear that even its name may be obliterated from the map. The inappropriate designation of Boston Highlands should be dropped, and its old and honored name of Roxbury restored.

CHAPTER XVII.

DORCHESTER IN THE LAST HUNDRED YEARS.

BY THE REV. SAMUEL J. BARROWS,

Minister of the First Parish, 1876–80.

THE history of Dorchester for the last hundred years is not a history of striking events. From the external side it lacks brilliancy and incident, and may not be very picturesque; but the history of no New-England town could be written from its external side only. Beneath the staid, quiet, homely life of the last century there have always been deep currents of moral, intellectual, and religious force, which worked silently and persistently, and carried the life of the town with them. In critical times we see these forces breaking out with great vehemence; but, for the most part, they move on as noiselessly as the sap ascends the channels of the tree.

We may see by looking at such a town as Dorchester, and many other New England towns, how much growth may take place in ideas, morals, and the internal life of a community without greatly affecting its external institutions. It may be truly said of the New-England town, what seems rather paradoxical when applied to material things, — that it is larger on the inside than on the outside. Nevertheless, we soon distrust the permanence and reality of the spirit of progress unless we see it taking outward form and effect; and Dorchester can point to substantial embodiments of that spirit in its own history. It may be said, however, that in this town progress always struggled with a powerful conservative tendency which prevented it from advancing too hastily on the one hand, while it retarded sometimes that advancement which was necessary for its health. If the old settlers could wake up and see the town as it is to-day, they would recognize a vast number of changes. Would they be willing to admit that every change is an improvement?

In our last chapter[1] we carried the history of Dorchester through the provincial period to the close of the Revolutionary War. We find the town, geographically and materially, just where it stood before, but with the old-time loyalty directed with increased fervor towards the new government to which it had transferred its allegiance, and which it had given so much of its

[1] Vol. II p. 357.

blood and treasure to establish. It is a fact to be noted, that whatever conservatism Dorchester may have had in practical methods, it was always radical and progressive in its patriotism. Whenever the question of civil liberty came up, it was in the fore-front.

It has been noticed that Dorchester's jealousy of any interference with State rights and liberties led it to be suspicious and oppositive of the union of the colonies proposed in 1754; but when such a union was needed for the protection of the colonial liberties, the town was prompt and warm in its acceptance, and never wavered in its loyalty. In 1809, when Massachusetts was greatly disturbed and excited, owing to the imposition of the embargo, and inflammatory meetings were held in various towns protesting against the course of the Government, Dorchester was firm in its support. It drew up a remonstrance, and saw "with the sincerest sorrow that a number of towns were so lost to their national allegiance, and so heedless of the conflict which might result from the prosecution of their measures," that they had passed resolutions and presented petitions to the Legislature "highly insulting to the national authority, and appealing to the authority of the State to resist the laws of the Union on a subject exclusively within the constitutional authority of the Government of the United States. We consider," they add, "the union of the American States as the ark of our safety and the rock of our defence against invasion from without or violence from within. We will, therefore, cling to it as the last hope of our liberties." There was an apprehension in Dorchester that the motive of some of the leaders in that "uneasiness" was to demolish the republican government and to erect a hereditary monarchy on its ruins. "A system of this kind or any part of it," they said, "we are free to declare we will oppose to blood." If the views of the town upon the subject of State rights are not indicated with sufficient clearness in the preceding paragraphs, they are left beyond doubt in the paragraph which follows: "To resist by arms a law of our State Legislature of an interior and local nature would be treason against the Commonwealth. On such an occasion the inhabitants of this town would be found among the first to support the laws and repel the treason. It also cannot be less an act of treason against the National Government to resist by force a law of theirs on the subject of national concerns, although unfortunately such resistance should be sanctioned by the State Legislature."

Surely here is a change from the suspicious spirit of 1754, when Dorchester feared a union of the colonies as destructive to the liberty of the State. If such was the position of the town in 1809, we need not be surprised at the stand which it took in 1861. It is hardly necessary to say that during the war of 1812–14 the town, without distinction of party, used all its means to "defend its soil and repel the hostile invader."

A profound interest in the life and development of the nation, of which Dorchester was one of the first seeds, is a marked feature in its history; yet the local affairs of the town were never neglected. The arts of peace were

more sedulously cultivated than the arts of war. The public spirit, which was prompt to rally when the nation was in danger, manifested itself in the long years of peace and plenty. It is shown in all matters relating to public improvements, in the construction of roads, the care of the old cemetery, the administration of the schools, and in a pious regard for the interests of religion. While the town is anxious over the result of the embargo, it is seriously considering the question of "inoculation by cow-pox." We are impressed again with the importance of the ministerial function at this time. "The two reverend ministers of the town and the selectmen" were appointed a committee to return "a respectable answer" to the important and interesting letter addressed to them by the selectmen and committee of the town of Malden on this subject. The town afterward voted to approve of the method, and to recommend it to the inhabitants of the town; and the ministers were requested to read these votes to the congregations the next Lord's Day after divine service. The doctors were asked to keep a register of those inoculated, and to return it to the town clerk; but otherwise they do not seem to have been consulted. The ravages of small-pox, which had visited Dorchester in previous years, may have hastened a decision on this point.

In reading the town records we are struck by the thoroughness with which the committees did their duty. Dorchester evidently seemed to them an important place; it was worthy of their best work. The reports on the condition of schools and on the general subject of education are models of conscientious and painstaking fidelity; and some of them, made within the last forty years, would bear re-printing for their broad and sensible views. In another part of the town records we have from the committee on roads a long treatise on the art of road-making, showing great practical knowledge of the subject, and written not only to interest the town ear, but to influence the town pocket. The excellent roads of Dorchester to-day are not wholly owing to annexation.

The cause of education did not languish. The individual bequests to the school fund, already noticed in the first volume, were increased in 1797 by the gift of nearly ten acres of woodland from the Hon. James Bowdoin, son of Governor Bowdoin; and in 1803 by the gift of a lot of land containing about five thousand feet, from John Capen, Jr. Noah Clapp, town clerk, in a letter to the Massachusetts Historical Society in 1792, says that up to that time more than thirty from Dorchester had been graduated at Harvard College, and that more than twenty of these had been preachers of the gospel, — a fact which shows that a close relation was assumed between education and religion.

In 1784 the town voted "that such girls as can read in the Psalter be allowed to go to the Grammar School from the first day of June to the first day of October."[1] This is the first vote in which provision is made for the public education of girls. Though there were dame-schools in which they

[1] *Town Records*, iv. 79.

received instruction in sewing and reading and spelling, their attendance on the public schools seems to have been confined previously to one afternoon annually at the general catechising in the fall of the year, "where each child was expected to answer two questions at least from the Assembly's catechism."[1] By the year 1803 there were four annual schools established. The town made a small yearly appropriation for their support, the salary of the teacher being about what a private soldier receives now in our army, — thirteen dollars a month and board. The annual appropriation for schools in 1812 was $2,700, and from 1820 to 1824, $2,300. The six school-masters then received $400 each, the income from school funds amounting to $257. In the years 1825 and 1828 the appropriation was $2,500; in 1830, $2,300. In 1857 the amount voted for schools in Dorchester was $23,622.98, or ten times as much as in 1830. The sum appropriated by the town for the public education of each child between the ages of five and fifteen was in that year (1857) $13.18. Dorchester stood in that respect the third in the Commonwealth, and the second in Norfolk County, — the towns of Brookline and Nahant alone exceeding it. In 1869 — the last year of Dorchester's life as a town — the appropriation for schools was $54,000.

A committee in 1827 reported it expedient to have a High School; but the report was not accepted, and final action was not taken until 1852, when an appropriation of $6,000 was made for the building and a central location selected, so that four fifths of the children of the town were within two miles of the school-house. Such a central location was necessary, as the town, in spite of loss of territory, was still nine miles long and two and a half broad,[2] and contained eight thousand inhabitants. The High School was opened in December, 1852, when fifty-nine scholars were admitted. The first principal was Mr. William J. Rolfe, who was succeeded by Mr. Jonathan Kimball in 1856. Mr. Elbridge Smith is the present incumbent.

In the previous record the religious history of the town has been practically synonymous with the history of the parish. It continued to be so until the early part of this century. With the increase of population other houses of worship became necessary. With larger toleration and growth in opinion, Dorchester, characterized for nearly two hundred years by remarkable religious unity, became the home of a variety of churches and sects.

The Rev. Thaddeus Mason Harris succeeded the Rev. Moses Everett as pastor of the First Parish, and was ordained October, 1793. He was born in Charlestown, Mass., July 7, 1768; graduated at Harvard in 1787. He is well remembered by many of the old citizens of Dorchester and Boston for his genial nature, his sparkling wit, his aptness in the choice of texts and subjects, and the fountains of tears that were often unsealed in the delivery of his earnest and moving discourses. The shelves of Harvard College Library, of which he was librarian for a short time before going to Dorchester, bear many of his works, which attest his scholarship and the

[1] *History of Dorchester*, p. 450. [2] *Records*, x. 610.

wide range of his studies in science, religion, and history. Dr. Harris was a prominent member of the Massachusetts Historical Society, and he deserves especial mention in this book because of his deep interest in the history of the town and of the church whose pastor he was for forty-three years. He did more than any one before him to collect and arrange the written, and to record the oral, traditions of the place and people.

Dr. Harris was succeeded by the Rev. Nathaniel Hall, who became associated with him as colleague in 1835, was made sole pastor in 1836, and



THADDEUS MASON HARRIS.[1]

held the office till his death in 1875, — a period of forty years. Mr. Hall's saintly character and his devotion to his calling were marked features of his effective but unpretentious ministry. He was succeeded by the writer of this chapter.

In a period of two hundred and fifty years the First Parish of Dorchester had but ten successive ministers; but from the settlement of Richard Mather, in 1636, to 1876, — a period of two hundred and forty years, — there were but seven successive ministers, with an average pastorate of thirty-four years each. There have been six deacons who have held office over forty years each. Deacon Ebenezer Clapp, the father of the present deacon of that name, held office for fifty-one years. Deacon Henry Humphreys, one

[1] This cut follows a miniature likeness owned by his daughter, still living in South Boston. A memoir of Dr. Harris by the Rev. N. L. Frothingham, D.D., with a long list of his publications, is in 4 *Mass. Hist. Coll.*, ii. See also *Funeral Sermon* by Rev. Nathaniel Hall.

of the present deacons, has served forty-eight years. Meeting-house Hill has been the site of the church building for two hundred and ten years. The society has had five meeting-houses, some of which have been previously noticed. The present building dates from 1816, but has received various additions and improvements.

There is one very interesting feature about the history of the First Parish, to which allusion was made on the two hundred and fiftieth anniversary of its formation, held June 17, 1880. It is, that, while from time to time there were controversies and agitations concerning practical measures, such as the introduction of a new hymn-book, or the change of the method of singing from "lining out" into singing by note, there is nothing in the history of the church which shows just when it ceased to be Calvinistic and became Unitarian. The transition was silently and almost insensibly made.[1]

In 1806 the Second Church was formed at the south end of the parish, to meet the wants of the residents in that locality. The separation from the First Parish was very peaceably and affectionately made. Dr. Harris preached the dedication sermon of the new church.[2] When Dr. John Codman was ordained pastor in 1807, the sermon was preached by Dr. Channing. The property of the First Church and Parish was afterward divided between the two organizations and the subsequently formed Third Society, in proportion to the numbers of each.

The theological controversy, which the First Parish was spared, began soon after to rage with considerable violence in the Second Church. The theological councils that settled it could not allay the bitter feeling which was engendered, and which, though now extinct, continued for many years. As a result of this controversy, the Second Church allied itself with the Orthodox party, retaining its pastor, Dr. Codman. The opposing party withdrew and formed the Third Religious Society. Dr. Codman remained pastor of the Second Church till his death in 1847. The Rev. James H. Means was ordained and succeeded to the pulpit in 1848; and after a very successful pastorate of thirty years, marked also by eminent fidelity as a citizen of the town, he resigned in 1878. His successor, the present pastor, is the Rev. E. N. Packard.

The Third Religious Society, as already stated, was formed largely of members who left the Second Church of Dorchester. They built a meeting-house at the Lower Mills, which was dedicated in 1813, and was replaced by another built in 1840.[3]

Up to 1817, or a period of one hundred and eighty-seven years, Congregationalism was the only church polity known in Dorchester, and for one hundred and seventy-six years had been confined to a single organization. In 1817 the uniformity of the church government was broken by the estab-

[1] See *Proceedings of the 250th Anniversary of the First Church and Parish of Dorchester*, p. 118.

[2] The bill of expenses of that dedication service is still preserved by the Second Parish, and it is interesting to note among the items, "whiskey," "Madeira wine," and "gin for the sexton," as part of the approved expenses.

[3] [The succession of pastors of this church is given in Dr. Peabody's chapter in the present volume. — Ed.]

lishment of a Methodist Episcopal Church, whose first building was dedicated May 6, 1818, and succeeded by another in September, 1829.[1] The long roll of ministers which, in accordance with the Methodist system, this church has had, presents a strange contrast to the small number settled over the ancient church of the town.

A Baptist church was organized at Neponset in 1837; and another, — the North Baptist Church, corner of Sumner and Stoughton streets, — in 1840. An Episcopal church — St. Mary's — was organized in 1847. Instead of the single church existing at the beginning of this century, there are now twenty-one churches in the Dorchester District; namely, ten Congregational, — five of which are Trinitarian, four Unitarian, and one Universalist, — four Methodist, three Episcopalian, two Baptist, and two Roman Catholic.[2]

In the earliest years of its history the inhabitants of Dorchester found their chief occupation in fishing and farming and trading. Dorchester never developed great commercial importance, nor did it abound in manufactures; yet the water-power on the Neponset River was very early utilized, as was noticed in the first volume. The old grist mill was afterward followed by a fulling mill and a snuff mill. In 1727 a paper mill was established;[3] and as early as 1765 the manufacture of chocolate was begun, — the first made in New England. Dorchester chocolate is still known throughout the country for its excellence; and chocolate and paper mills have continued to be very important features of its industry.

A corporation of the proprietors of mills on Mill Creek and Neponset River was formed in 1798. Several tanneries were also located in the town, and the pits where some of them stood have not yet been filled up.

In later years, while commerce at Commercial Point has decreased, the manufactories have mainly centred at Neponset; while South Boston — the district which Dorchester first ceded to the city of Boston — has become the site of many of the largest iron works in the country.[4] What is still known as the Dorchester District, however, has been, and promises to remain for years to come, a place of residence for those whose occupation is in the city proper. A few of the old farms are left, but the majority have been cut up by streets and divided into building lots.

Dorchester has long been famous for its interest in horticulture. Dorchester and Roxbury furnished all the presidents and treasurers of the Massachusetts Horticultural Society for the first twenty years after its formation. The Rev. Dr. Harris, Captain William R. Austin, William Clapp, Zebedee Cook, Elijah Vose, Hon. Marshall P. Wilder, John Richardson, Samuel Downer, and Thaddeus Clapp are some among the living and the

[1] [See Dr. Dorchester's chapter in this volume. — Ed.]

[2] If we add South Boston, Washington Village, and Hyde Park, which were included within the Dorchester limits at the beginning of this century, the comparative number of churches would be much increased.

[3] [See Vol. II., p. 462. — Ed.]

[4] [See the chapter on "The Industries of Boston," in Vol. IV. — Ed.]

dead who have devoted themselves zealously to the culture and improvement of fruits and flowers. Hon. Marshall P. Wilder has cultivated in his own orchard more than twelve hundred kinds of fruit; and on one occasion sent over four hundred varieties of the pear for exhibition.[1]

The love of the simple old colonial ways lingered long in Dorchester, and made it somewhat intolerant of modern inventions. The conservative character of the town was shown in its opposition to railroads. In 1842 a petition was presented to the Legislature for the privilege of building a railroad from Boston to Quincy, by any one of three routes. The town opposed it at a meeting, Feb. 2, 1842, saying: "A great portion of the road will lead through thickly-settled and populous parts of the town, crossing and running contiguous to public highways, and thereby making a permanent obstruction to the free intercourse of our citizens from one part of the town to another, and creating great and enduring danger and hazard to all travel upon the common roads." The town suggested that, if it be built at all, it be built over the marsh. The representative of the town in the Legislature was instructed to use his "utmost endeavor to prevent, if possible, so great a calamity to our town as must be the location of any railroad through it." A committee was appointed and counsel employed to oppose the petition before the Legislature. The town believed that "the property and the comfort, and perhaps the lives, of their fellow-citizens were deeply interested in the result of their remonstrance, and that the expenses of the ablest counsel were not to be considered when such interests were at stake." In 1844, when a petition was made for the formation of the Old Colony Road from Boston to Plymouth, and the petition for a road to Quincy was renewed, it was opposed again by the committee of the town; but opposition was finally ineffectual, and Dorchester was eventually doomed to the "calamity" of having two steam railroads, with branch tracks. The nature of that calamity would receive a new interpretation to-day, if these roads for any reason should be abandoned.

The earnest and devoted patriotism which Dorchester showed during the two wars with Great Britain was repeated in the war of the Rebellion. It is hardly worth while to refer to the attitude of the town as expressed in the resolutions which it was prompt to pass at the outbreak of the war. A complete exhibit of what was really done would furnish more substantial testimony. From the report of Adjutant-General Schouler, it appears that Dorchester furnished one thousand three hundred and forty-two men for the war, which was a surplus of one hundred and twenty-three over and above all demands. Of these, thirty-one were commissioned officers. From figures furnished by Mr. N. W. Tileston, who has given much study to this subject, we learn that the whole amount of money appropriated and expended by the town on account of the war, exclusive of State aid, was $125,319.30. The amount received by the town from the State as State aid

[1] [See Colonel Wilder's chapter, in Vol. IV. — Ed.]

was $65,606.99. In the work of relief among the soldiers, the churches of Dorchester did a noble service. The Benevolent Society of the First Parish was organized Nov. 8, 1861, largely for this object. This society alone during the war sent to the soldiers provisions and supplies worth from fifteen to twenty thousand dollars. The other churches did similar work, and together must have furnished a like amount. On Sunday, Aug. 31, 1862, when the news of the result of the second battle of Bull Run reached Dorchester, all the parishes in town dispensed with religious services in the afternoon, and applied themselves to picking lint, making bandages, and packing clothes, wine, jellies, and other refreshments for the sick and wounded. The First Parish alone sent off twenty-one cases the next day. The amount contributed by societies and private individuals for the relief of soldiers and seamen during the war exceeded the sum of $50,000.

The number of Dorchester citizens who perished in the war was one hundred. This does not include the number of men from other towns who were sent as recruits to fill up the Dorchester companies, or those who served in the navy. A large number of these were killed or died in rebel prisons, or were never heard from.

In previous chapters we have noticed the fluctuation in the Dorchester boundary. While the soul of the town was never diminished, there was from time to time an atrophy of the body. A slice was lost here and a slice there, until the original territory was very much diminished. Until 1793 Dorchester, as has been said, was a part of Suffolk County, and thus practically joined to Boston in all judicial matters; but more than fifty years before this time an agitation was begun for a separation from Boston, the complaint being made that the people who had business at the courts in the city were long detained, to the great expense of time and money. The town, therefore, voted, in 1743, that it was desirous that the country town-meeting be separated from Boston, and erected into a district and county by itself. In 1784 this vote was re-affirmed. When the separation was finally made, in 1793, public opinion seems to have altered, and the change met with much opposition. The town presented a memorial to the Legislature protesting against the division of the county of Suffolk, and praying that Dorchester might be re-annexed thereto. The reasons for the opposition were the cost of additional buildings, and the great advantages attending the transaction of business in the metropolis, as the new shire town was in a place inconvenient for the memorialists. The opposition, however, was not successful; but the centrifugal force which threw off Dorchester, with neighboring towns, into a new county, did not save it from the centripetal movement which was gradually to draw the whole town back again, not only into Suffolk County, but within the corporate limits of Boston itself. Hungry Boston did not swallow Dorchester at one bite, — it took three meals to do it. It began in 1803, by nibbling at Dorchester Neck, now known as South Boston. Boston was steadily growing and becoming more

crowded. Dorchester Neck, which could easily be connected by a bridge, seemed to afford the needed relief. Most of the residents of Dorchester Neck were in favor of the annexation. They were far removed from the centre of the town, and the building of the bridge to Boston promised them many advantages. Dorchester was willing to have the bridge built, but voted against the annexation. A committee was appointed to present a remonstrance to the Legislature. The committee presented the lamentable fact that, since the incorporation of Dorchester, "the towns of Milton, Stoughton, and others had been set off from it, so that the remainder was only ten miles in length, and contained little more than seven thousand acres of land."

But a joint committee of both Houses reported in favor of the annexation, without compensation to Dorchester. At a town-meeting, where the action of the legislative committee was detailed, one of the Dorchester committee stated that $6,000 might be obtained provided the town would not oppose the project; but the town was obstinate, and voted *not* to accept the $6,000 on the conditions offered. The bill passed the Legislature March 6, 1804; and Dorchester lost the money and the territory too.

In 1836 the inhabitants of Little Neck, Washington Village, petitioned to be joined to Boston. They were four miles from the town house, and upwards of a mile from any school, and represented that they were wholly debarred from school privileges for several successive days in each month by the tide-water being permitted to overflow the public road. The town of Dorchester opposed the annexation. The committee of the General Court reported against it, because Boston would incur great expense in laying out the streets across the salt marsh; but the matter was only delayed, for Washington Village was finally annexed to Boston May 21, 1855.

It took but ten or twelve years for Boston to digest this last slice of territory, and then it was hungry for more. The sister town of Roxbury was the first victim. Her annexation to Boston in 1868, far from meeting the growing wants of Boston, only indicated that the annexation of Dorchester was but a question of time. In 1867 the subject was more or less agitated by the citizens of Dorchester themselves, who brought the matter before the Boston city government, and secured the appointment of a board of commissioners to confer with commissioners appointed by the town. The commission was unable to agree, but expressed the opinion that it might become desirable to annex a portion of the town of Dorchester, "in order to complete the elaborate system of drainage and harbor improvement devised for the benefit of Boston." No immediate action followed, but a year later the matter was taken up, — this time from the Boston side; and by order of the common council, passed Dec. 22, 1868, the mayor was requested to appoint a commission of three discreet and intelligent persons carefully to examine the subject in all its financial, industrial, and sanitary relations, and to report the result of their doings to the city council. The final report of this commission presented many interesting facts

which serve to show the condition of Dorchester on the eve of the annexation.[1]

While Dorchester from 1657 had steadily lost in territory through redivision of its boundaries, there was a great gain in wealth and population. The population of Dorchester in 1855 was 8,340; in 1865, 10,707, — an increase of 2,377 in ten years; a gain of $28\frac{50}{100}$ per cent. The magnitude which town affairs had assumed is also seen by the annual appropriations at town-meetings. Notwithstanding the much greater geographical extent of the original town, its early expenses seem small enough when compared with those for 1869, — a few months before the vote on annexation was taken.[2] The result of the city commissioners' examination was a unanimous report for annexation, based on "the necessity for a part, and the desirableness of the whole, of the territory for the present and prospective wants of the city, and the highly favorable financial, industrial, and sanitary condition of the town." The commissioners noted the "strong feeling of attachment to the name of the town and its history and traditions" which was manifested, and thought that, by the annexation of the whole territory, Dorchester might continue to retain her boundary and local history as a precinct of the city.

In May, 1869, the subject came up before the Legislature. The mayor and city council urged the annexation. The town of Dorchester was represented by a committee of eighteen gentlemen, who presented a petition signed by between eight and nine hundred citizens. The matter came to a hearing before the joint committee on towns. There was no organized opposition from Dorchester, but the measure was opposed by the Norfolk County Commissioners. As a result of these hearings a majority of the committee reported in favor of annexation, and presented the draft of a bill for that purpose. A minority report urged that the annexation would be of no commercial advantage to Boston, and that it would be of no benefit to Dorchester. "Her town affairs," they said, "appear to be well managed; her

[1] Its number of inhabitants was estimated at twelve thousand.

Dwelling-houses, May 1, 1868	1,830
Ratable polls	2,918
Legal voters	2,100
Churches	13
School-houses, of the larger class	7
" " " smaller class	3
One steam fire-engine, and several hand-engines	
Scholars	2,000
Acres of land	4,532

Valuation for 1868: —

Real estate	$5,291,200
Personal	6,035,100

The financial condition of the town was as follows: —

Town debt	$147,700.00
Cash on hand Feb. 1, 1869	
Due from State and for taxes	111,092.41
Actual debt	$36,607.59
Valuation of town property	237,182.26

[2] The appropriations for that year were as follows: —

For Schools	$54,000
Poor in alms-house	5,000
Poor out of alms-house	3,500
Insane at hospital	2,000
Fire department	10,000
Highways	25,000
Volunteer companies	1,050
Town officers	6,[illegible]
Cemeteries	1,5[illegible]
Instalments and interest	27,[illegible]
Interest in anticipation of taxes	5,[illegible]
Abatement of taxes	4,[illegible]
Lighting streets	6,[illegible]
Police and watch	[illegible]
Incidental expenses	[illegible]
Removal of engine-house No. 3	2,[illegible]
Widening of Hancock Street	5,[illegible]
" " Minot "	4,[illegible]
" " Adams "	[illegible]
" " Bird	[illegible]
Total	$188,050

roads are in good condition; her schools are among the best in the Commonwealth: and we fail to see that there is anything in her local affairs which cannot be as well provided for by the town as by Boston, and with as great economy." The Legislature accepted the majority report, and passed an act annexing the town, provided that a majority of legal voters in Boston and in Dorchester were in favor of it. A special election was held simultaneously in both places, on June 22, 1869. The whole number of votes cast in Dorchester was 1,654. There were 928 for annexation and 726 against, — a majority of 202. According to the provisions of the act, the annexation took place on the first Monday in January (4th), 1870.

The last town-meeting was held Dec. 28, 1869, when the reports of the selectmen were received, and a vote of thanks tendered to all the town officers. And thus the town-meeting, which Dorchester was the first of the New England settlements to establish, ceased to be held in the parent town; but only when the town itself had no longer an existence. By this act of annexation the area of Boston, which with the annexation of Roxbury amounted to 5,370 acres, was nearly doubled, — Dorchester adding 4,532 acres. If we add the area which Boston acquired by annexing South Boston and Washington Village, 900 acres, the total acreage she obtained from Dorchester was 5,432.

It is now ten years since the annexation, covering a period of long business depression, unfavorable to rapid growth; but the results of the union with Boston are plainly visible. Houses are now springing up on hill and plain. Here and there a long block of brick buildings disturbs with its uniformity the picturesque variety of rural architecture, and reminds the old resident of the spread of the city limits. The work of cutting new streets, extending the sewers and water-pipes, and improving the roads goes steadily on. The stranger to-day who wishes to see how Boston is growing as a place of residence must inspect the Dorchester district. One hundred and seventy-five buildings were erected here in 1880, the greater number of these being dwelling-houses. By the latest census returns, we find that the Dorchester District, as it was before the ward division, has a population of twenty thousand, — an increase of eight thousand in ten years.

Amid all the changes which have been made and those which are still making, there is one spot in the town where the colonial, the provincial, and the national periods are all blended in the associations of the tablets which mark the resting-places of the dead. The old burying-ground is sacredly preserved. New and beautiful cemeteries have been added in other parts of the town, yet here, where the dust of the ancient settlers is gathered together, the iron gate is still open for the funeral cortége.



CHAPTER XVIII.

BRIGHTON IN THE LAST HUNDRED YEARS.

BY FRANCIS S. DRAKE.

A CENTURY ago, Brighton, not yet incorporated as a town, nor known throughout the land as the great cattle-mart of New England, was simply a precinct or ecclesiastical parish of Cambridge, the shire-town of Middlesex County. It was then a thinly-settled farming village, having a single meeting-house and two school-houses, its sixty dwelling houses containing a population of about four hundred souls. When, in 1805, its incorporation as a town was proposed, little opposition was made, public opinion as to the justice and expediency of the measure having for some time steadily gained ground. What rendered the step all the easier was the fact that common cause was made with Brighton by the Second Parish, which also desired a separation from Cambridge. A petition, signed by all the well-known voters of the precinct, presented in a forcible manner many of the reasons which had brought about its separation as a parish, and which were equally applicable at the present juncture. The action of the town was as follows: —

"Cambridge, South Precinct, Feb. 17, 1806.

"At a meeting of the freeholders and other inhabitants on the south side of Charles River, legally warned and assembled, after choosing Mr. Jonathan Winship, moderator, the following votes were passed: First, to petition the honorable General Court to be set off as a town; Second, to choose a committee to wait on the honorable General Court with the petition; Third, that Mr. Samuel Wyllis Pomeroy, Mr. Gorham Parsons, Stephen Dana, Esq., Mr. Thomas English, Mr. Daniel Bowen, compose this committee.

"Attest: HENRY DANA, *Precinct Clerk.*"

By an Act of the Legislature, dated Feb. 24, 1807, the town of Brighton was formally incorporated. The town of West Cambridge, or Menotomy, the Second Parish, was incorporated in the same month, and by the separation of the two Cambridge lost a large portion of her territory. Brighton received another instalment of the mother town by annexation, Jan. 27, 1816.

At the first town-meeting, held May 9, 1807, Henry Dana was chosen town clerk, and Nathaniel Champney, treasurer. Dudley Hardy, Jonathan Livermore, Thomas Gardner (son of the colonel), Benjamin Hill, and Nathaniel Champney were appointed selectmen. Stephen Dana was soon afterward chosen representative to the General Court, and the sum of two thousand dollars was appropriated to defray town charges. Mr. Dana, the first town-clerk, served ten years and until his death. Of his successors, Captain Joseph Warren served eighteen years, and William Warren twenty-two years; the latter's son, William Wirt Warren, succeeded him; and he in turn was followed by a brother, Webster F. Warren. Of the early town treasurers, Nathaniel Champney, the first, served twenty years and until his death, and was succeeded by Deacon Thaddeus Baldwin. Henry Heath Larnard served from 1833 to 1869.[1]

Cambridge Street, an important thoroughfare, was opened in 1808, from Winship's store to the Brookline road (Harvard Street). At a very large and full meeting, held September 12, President Jefferson was memorialized relative to the Embargo law. In 1818 an almshouse was purchased by the town, which, however, seems to have had very few inmates. It contained but one resident pauper at the date of annexation. The old church, after its removal in 1809, continued in use as a town hall until the building of a new and more commodious edifice, dedicated Dec. 30, 1841. Its corner-stone had been laid on the 2d of August previous. Upon annexation in 1874, when town-meetings and town discussions were to give way forever to quiet ward-room elections of city officers, the town hall was appropriated for police purposes and its main hall fitted up as a municipal court-room for the district.

In June, 1825, General Lafayette visited Brighton, and was hospitably entertained by the citizens at the hotel on the corner of Washington and Cambridge streets. This building, which in early times had been the mansion-house of the Winship family, was at that time occupied by Mr. Samuel Dudley. The school children were arranged in two lines, between which the General, accompanied by his son, George Washington Lafayette, passed. Some of those children still remember that bright June day, and fondly cherish the recollection of the kiss bestowed upon them by the gallant Frenchman. A lady who saw him at this time says: "The appearance of Lafayette, with his coat thrown back, his ugly, benevolent, kind, old French face, with the high reddish-brown wig, and the small, beaming eyes, is indelibly fixed in my memory."

On the occasion of Henry Clay's visit to the town in October, 1833, a bountiful collation was spread in the large dining-hall of the recently erected Cattle Fair Hotel. Mr. Clay is said to have recognized in the yards some of his fine steers, which, as it was before the day of railroads, had made the tedious journey from Ashland, Kentucky, on foot. In the following year

[1] The town acknowledged its appreciation of his long and faithful services by presenting him, on his retirement from office, with a massive silver pitcher, bearing an appropriate inscription.

the Boston and Worcester, now the Boston and Albany, Railroad was opened.[1]

On Feb. 24, 1857, half a century of the town's existence was completed, during which it had gained materially in population and in wealth. The day was joyfully celebrated by the glad peal of church bells at sunrise and sunset, by the discharge of cannon, and by brilliant fireworks in the evening. One citizen only, Mr. Edward Sparhawk, was living who had voted for the town's incorporation fifty years before. He was a descendant of Nathaniel Sparhawk, one of the earliest emigrant settlers of Cambridge, and died Sept. 3, 1867, in his ninety-seventh year.

At a town-meeting, May 3, 1861, called for the purpose of raising a volunteer company for the war of the Rebellion which had just begun, two thousand dollars was appropriated to uniform and equip said company, and twenty dollars was also voted to each private when called into active service. July 15, 1862, the town voted to pay one hundred and twenty-five dollars bounty for each volunteer to make up its quota of forty men; the five thousand dollars required, to be raised by a tax on property, poll-tax payers to contribute such sums as they saw fit. The town's quota was filled in three months. October 21, it was voted to pay each nine months' volunteer one hundred dollars, and the town treasurer was authorized to borrow the money. November 26, one thousand two hundred dollars was appropriated by the town to furnish the town's quota under the President's new call. Though not represented in the army by any distinct organization, Brighton furnished three hundred and sixty-five men to aid in suppressing the Rebellion, — a surplus of five over the number required. Fifteen were commissioned officers. The amount of money expended by the town, exclusive of State aid, was seventy-eight thousand and fifty dollars.

The act of incorporation required the town to keep open and support, as she had heretofore done, the bridge over Charles River. This subject, as well as that of the fisheries of the river, — once a matter of considerable pecuniary interest, — was from time to time discussed and acted upon by the town-meeting. By an Act of the Legislature, passed March 11, 1862, the city of Cambridge and the town of Brighton were "authorized and required to rebuild the great bridge over Charles River," the expense to be borne "in proportion to the respective valuations of said city and town;" and it was provided that a draw not less than thirty-two feet wide should be constructed "at an equal distance from each abutment," that "the opening in the middle of said draw" should be the dividing line between Cambridge and Brighton at that point, and that thereafter each corporation should maintain its half part of the whole structure at its own expense. This, with all her other public obligations, was assumed by the city of Boston upon annexation.

After a municipal existence of sixty-seven years, the annexation of Brighton to Boston was effected, Jan. 5, 1874, the Act of the Legislature

[1] [See Mr C. F. Adams's chapter on Canals and Railroads. — Ed.]

authorizing it, dated May 21, 1873, having been accepted by the city and town, Oct. 8, 1873. To produce this result, the town in January, 1872, memorialized the Legislature for annexation, and its petition was unanimously sustained by a commission appointed by the city to examine and report thereon. To the city the advantages of annexation were to be found in the protection of public health by inspection and supervision of her meat supply, and by organizing under one head a general system of sewerage, in concert of action in projecting improvements of mutual benefit, and in the acquisition of territory for houses at a moderate cost. The needs of Brighton were a more plentiful supply of water, a better system of streets and drainage as well as protection from fire, and better police and health regulations. These desirable ends either have been, or are in a fair way of being, satisfactorily accomplished.[1]

We have elsewhere recorded the gathering of the First Church here in 1780, — some thirty persons in all, including a few from Newton, Menotomy, and Brookline, having thus associated themselves together for religious worship. The present church edifice occupies very nearly the site of the original building of 1744, which stood in front of it, a little to the west. It was begun Sept. 21, 1808, and completed for dedication, June 22, 1809. The old church was then moved to a spot opposite the site of the town house, its lower story converted into two school-rooms, and its upper story into a town hall. Rev. John Foster, D.D., its first pastor, was born in Western, now Warren, Massachusetts, April 19, 1763; graduated at Dartmouth College in 1783; resigned his pastorate here, Oct. 31, 1827, at the close of its forty-third year, and died Sept. 16, 1829. Mr. Foster was a scholarly and kindly man, a good talker, and dwelt more upon the practical than the theoretical side of religion. He resided for a long time in the old parsonage still standing at the foot of Rockland Street. A monument in the ancient burying-ground on Market Street bears an inscription from the pen of the Rev. Dr. Francis, of Watertown, testifying to his piety, fidelity, and usefulness. In 1785 he married Hannah, daughter of Grant Webster. Mrs. Foster was the author of *The Coquette, or History of Eliza Wharton*, one of the earliest of American novels. Two of her daughters, Mrs. Cushing and Mrs. Cheney, are well-known writers.[2] This church is, in sentiment, Congregational Unitarian.

Of the seven churches now in Brighton, the next in order is the Evangelical Congregational church, gathered April 4, 1827. Its first house, dedicated Sept. 13, 1827, was removed in June, 1867, to give place to the new edifice on the same site. Services were held in the old house till November 3, and on December 20 the society worshipped in the vestry of

[1] [See Mr. Bugbee's chapter, "Under the Mayors," in the present volume. — Ed.]

[2] Dr. Foster's successors are named in Dr. Peabody's chapter; one of them, Frederic A. Whitney, son of the Rev. Peter Whitney, was born at Quincy, Massachusetts, Sept. 13, 1812; graduated at Harvard College, 1833; ordained Feb. 21, 1844, and died Oct. 21, 1880.

their new church. Its corner-stone had been laid Aug. 13, 1867, and the church was dedicated May 14, 1868.[1]

Third in the order of time is the Roman Catholic Church. Prior to the building of its first house on Bennett Street in May, 1856, services had been held in private halls by the Rev. J. M. Finotti, minister in charge. This house was destroyed by fire, Dec. 7, 1862. A new building of wood on the same site proving insufficient for the wants of the society, the corner-stone of the large stone edifice on the northwest corner of Market and Arlington streets was laid Sept. 22, 1872. It is not yet completed, but services are held in its vestry by Rev. P. J. Rogers, minister in charge. Saint Columbkille, as this church is named, is one of the largest and most imposing churches of the order.[2]

The Brighton Avenue Baptist Church, in Union Square, was organized Dec. 2, 1853. Its corner-stone was laid Sept. 11, 1855; services were first held in its vestry in January, 1856, and it was dedicated Feb. 10, 1857.[3]

The First Universalist church, in Cambridge Street near Union Square, was organized June 12, 1860. Its chapel was dedicated Aug. 7, 1861.[4]

Services of the Protestant Episcopal Church were first held in Brighton town hall, Sept. 10, 1854, by the Rev. Cyrus F. Knight. They were continued by lay readers and neighboring clergymen until the church of the Epiphany was organized, Jan. 8, 1863, with David Greene Haskins as rector. A church edifice was erected on Washington Street, corner of Church Street, in which services were first held, Sept. 1, 1864. This property was sold in 1872, and a new parish, Saint Margaret's, organized; Charles A. Holbrook being rector. He was succeeded by Thomas Cole. Its present rector is Augustus Prime.

The Methodist Episcopal church, on the corner of Farrington and Harvard avenues, the seventh and last established in Brighton, was organized March 24, 1872, and the corner-stone of its edifice was laid on Christmas day, 1876. During its erection the society worshipped in the Universalist church.[5]

Besides the original school-house of 1722, there was, prior to the year 1800, a second on the west corner of Cambridge and North Harvard streets, which was removed about 1830. The teachers of these early public schools, as well as of the private schools with which the town has always been well provided, were very generally supplied, as was the pulpit here, from those who were in some way associated with the neighboring college. The district

[1] [The succession of the pastors is given in Dr. Tarbox's chapter on "Congregational (Trinitarian) Churches" in this volume. — Ed.]

[2] [See the chapter on "The Roman Catholic Church." — Ed.]

[3] Its pastors have been: J. M. Graves (Feb. 1, 1854–Jan. 1, 1856; died Jan. 15, 1879, aged 76); J. M. Benham (July 28, 1856–Sept. 1, 1857); J. W. Parker (Nov. 1, 1857–July 1, 1859); S. M. Stimson (Aug. 7, 1859–June 1, 1861); Ralph H. Bowles (Aug. 23, 1861–Jan. 1, 1867); William R. Thompson (Aug. 6, 1868–Aug. 31, 1871); F. E. Tower (Jan. 1, 1872 —).

[4] [For the succession of pastors in this church see Dr. Miner's chapter on "The Century of Universalism" in this volume. — Ed.]

[5] Its ministers have been: John P. Otis (1872–74); Willard Taylor Perrin (1874–76); William G. Richardson (1876–79); W. H. Hatch (1879–80); W. G. Leonard (1880 —).

system of schools was superseded here by the graded system soon after its adoption by Cambridge in 1834. A school similar in character to a high school, established by a private corporation on Academy Hill, was kept here in 1839 and 1840 by Josiah Rutter. This was superseded by the public high school kept in the same building, and taught by John Ruggles from 1841 to 1859. Upon the excellent foundation laid by the ripe scholarship and wide experience of Mr. Ruggles, a flourishing institution has been reared.[1] A liberal support was accorded to her schools after the incorporation of the town; and in the years 1842 and 1843 she stood first among the cities and towns of the Commonwealth in the *pro rata* appropriation for each pupil. Two of Brighton's largest school-houses, the Allston and the Bennett schools, are among the finest in the city. The land upon which the latter stands, on Agricultural Hill, was given to the town in 1861 by Stephen H. Bennett.

The private schools of Brighton are often referred to in records of the last century. James, son of Caleb Dana, taught a well-remembered school for boys and girls at the beginning of the century in the old Dana mansion on Washington near Allston streets. Jacob Knapp, a graduate of Harvard in 1802, taught for several years, at his house on Bowen's Hill, a classical school of much repute for boys. Hosea Hildreth, a graduate of 1805, taught a private school, and also gave instruction in singing and music. Major Thomas Hovey, a soldier of the Revolution, — still remembered in tradition, — J. F. Durivage, Teacher Miles, and Jonas Wilder taught private schools here more than fifty years ago. Professor Henry W. Torrey, of Harvard University, and several others, while undergraduates, taught in the public schools at different periods. Until 1795 the schools were generally under the charge of the selectmen of Cambridge. At that time they came under the control of a committee of six, chosen to superintend them and "to carry into effect the School Act." The Rev. John Foster and Jonathan Winship represented Brighton upon this committee. In 1820 there were three public schools in the town, having an attendance of one hundred and seventy children out of two hundred and thirty-three of a suitable age; in 1846 the pupils numbered four hundred.

As early as 1824, when there were as yet few public libraries in the State, the Brighton Social Library was formed by an association of citizens. This institution was in 1858 merged in the Brighton Library Association, incorporated by the legislature for the circulation of books, for public lectures, and for exercises in debate, declamation, and composition. In 1863 Mr. James Holton left a bequest for a public town-library, the provisions of which were fulfilled in 1864 by the election of trustees and the organization of the Holton Public Library. When Brighton was annexed, in 1874, the imposing library building of brick and freestone, on Rockland Street, begun by the town, was completed by the city at a cost of seventy thousand

[1] When he retired, in 1859, a festival in his honor, and a service of silver, testified to the appreciation in which he was held by his numerous friends and pupils.

dollars, and was dedicated, Oct. 29, 1875, as a branch of the Public Library of Boston.[1]

Until the establishment of a post-office in Brighton, in 1817, the people of the town were compelled to go over the river to Cambridge for postal service. The Rev. Noah Worcester, D.D., the first postmaster of the town, was commissioned Feb. 3, 1817, and held the office, assisted by a daughter, until age and infirmity obliged him to resign. He had been a citizen of Brighton, which he had several times represented in the State Legislature, from 1813 till his death, Oct. 31, 1837, aged seventy-nine. For some years he edited in Boston *The Christian Disciple*, subsequently entitled *The Friend of Peace*, of which cause he was commonly called the "Apostle." He was the intimate friend and associate of William Ellery Channing, and was eminent as a thinker and writer on theological and philanthropic subjects. His successors in the office have been J. B. Mason (1837–43), William Warren (1843–57), Timothy Munroe (1857–61), and John F. Day (1861–64), a soldier of the Republic who died of starvation in the rebel prison at Millen, Ga., in October, 1864. His widow, commissioned in 1865, has since had charge of the office. A second post-office, discontinued since annexation, was established in 1868 in the eastern part of Brighton, at the point where the Boston and Albany Railroad crosses Cambridge Street, formerly known as Cambridge Crossing. A new station-house was erected here by that corporation, and named Allston, — a designation which still attaches to this section of the city.

About the year 1810, the brothers Jonathan and Francis Winship began in a small way, on Washington Street, opposite their mansion-house, the trade in seeds and flowers, trees and fruits, which has since become so important a feature in the business of the town. These pioneers have been followed by Joseph Breck & Son, William C. Strong, and many others who have pursued the same healthful and attractive industry. The cultivation of the strawberry has long been a specialty here, — two noted varieties, the Brighton Pine and the Scott's Seedling, having originated in this town. Besides the large area occupied for nurseries in Brighton, about two hundred acres are devoted to market gardening.

The cattle business of Brighton, which dates from the occupation of Cambridge by Washington's forces in 1775, was established by Jonathan Winship, builder of the Winship mansion, a fine old residence of the last century still standing. Cattle were formerly driven from great distances to the Brighton market, and the sales were even then very large, as many as 5,000 beef-cattle being sold and slaughtered in a single week. In 1840 the sales amounted to $2,449,231. Before the day of railroads and the development of Chicago as a rival, most of the Brighton beef was put up in barrels and salted. The running of the Boston and Albany Railroad through the centre

[1] [A pamphlet giving an account of the dedicatory services was issued by the city, with an historical address by the Rev. Frederick A. Whitney. — Ed.]

of this district was the beginning of an era of more speedy and comfortable conveyance, and it at once largely increased the quantity of live-stock brought to market. As much as $2,000,000 per annum has been received by this road for the transportation of cattle, and it has recently expended large sums in increasing its facilities for this important business. For the year 1880, Brighton's receipts of live stock were, — cattle 229,894; sheep and lambs, 470,449; calves, 25,951; hogs, 751,198. The number of cattle slaughtered was 84,487; sheep, 307,126; calves, 13,434. This traffic,

THE WINSHIP MANSION.[1]

of which she once had a monopoly, is now shared with Watertown and North Cambridge. The establishment and successful operation of the abattoir has completely revolutionized this business. By an act of the Massachusetts Legislature, approved June 26, 1870, the Butchers' Slaughtering and Melting Association in Brighton was incorporated, with a capital of $200,000, for bringing the business of slaughtering, melting, and rendering under one general management. A tract of sixty acres of dry and sandy soil lying on the Charles River in the southwest part of the town, equally accessible to this and the Watertown market, was purchased. The work of building, grading, and constructing was begun in 1872, under the sanction

[1] The Winship house, a mansion of considerable importance in its day, was erected in 1780 by Jonathan Winship, a farmer who cultivated a large tract of land in its vicinity, and who died Oct. 3, 1784, aged 65. He was a descendant of Lieutenant Edward Winship (he wrote it Winshipp) who is found in Cambridge in 1635, where he was an active and energetic citizen. Its next occupant was Jonathan Winship, Jr., who also carried on the farm. He contracted for the supply of beef to the French fleet that visited Boston shortly after the Revolutionary War. The building at the right of the picture was used by him as a store.

of the State Board of Health, and business began in June, 1873. The investment in this enterprise of half a million dollars, enabling its projectors to improve in some respects upon the best foreign models, has completely transformed what was once a most repulsive business and a nuisance to everybody. Private slaughtering is prohibited in any section of the ward under heavy penalties. The grounds of the Association are bounded by Market Street and by Winship Avenue, with a frontage of about a thousand feet on Charles River, by which sloops and schooners approach the wharves which have been constructed on the territory. A branch of the Boston and Albany Railroad enters the enclosure.

An annual cattle-show and exhibition of domestic manufactures and agricultural products was established here in June, 1818, by the Massachusetts Agricultural Society. Suitable buildings were erected on Winship Place, Agricultural Hill. The fair was held in the month of October, and an annual address, together with a public dinner, ploughing matches, and various other exercises made the occasion one of great interest and enjoyment. Since the establishment of the numerous county agricultural societies throughout Massachusetts, this State exhibition has been abandoned. Agricultural Hall, the large building in which were held the indoor festivities of the Brighton Fair, now does duty as a hotel on the corner of Chestnut-Hill Avenue and Washington Street. The Cattle-Fair Hotel Corporation, established in 1830, erected in that year their large and handsome building on Market Square.

The first burial-ground in Brighton was laid out in Market Street, near the old meeting-house, in 1764, — that of old Cambridge, opposite the College, dating from 1635. This sufficed for the town until 1850, when it purchased the beautiful, well-wooded tract of fourteen acres on South Street, known as the Aspinwall Woods. The grounds were tastefully laid out and ornamented, and Evergreen Cemetery was publicly consecrated Aug. 7, 1850. Its Egyptian gateway was modelled after the first in Mount Auburn, and is appropriately inscribed. The monument of Holton, founder of the public library, and many other memorials of the dead are here, and it is daily becoming more and more attractive to the living.

At a town-meeting held April 24, 1865, only a few days after the surrender of Lee, it was voted to erect a monument to the Brighton soldiers who had fallen in the war. A committee was appointed to raise the money by voluntary subscriptions from each adult, and from each of the school children in the town. The soldiers' monument in Evergreen Cemetery, one of the first erected in the State, was dedicated July 26, 1866, in the presence of Brighton's surviving soldiers. An address was made by Mr. Bickford, chairman of the selectmen, the Rev. Frederic A. Whitney delivered the oration, prayer was offered by the Rev. Ralph H. Bowles, and original hymns by Anna H. Phillips and Dr. Augustus Mason were sung. The monument is of Quincy granite, and is thirty feet in height. Upon a

square base is placed a pyramidal plinth with inscriptions and names on all sides. Above this is a square shaft with moulded base and capital, upon the top of which is an eagle resting upon a ball. The die of the shaft is decorated with a shield, with stars and flags.

Among the noted men of Brighton not previously mentioned are: Daniel Bowen, who opened the first museum in Boston in 1791, owner of the fine old mansion on Bowen Hill, where he carried on the art of printing as early as 1802; Colonel Isaac Munroe, born here April 26, 1783, founder and editor of the *Baltimore Patriot*, eminent in character as in journalism, and who died Dec. 21, 1859; Rev. Titus Strong, D.D., author of many educational and theological works, forty years rector in Greenfield, Massachusetts, born in Brighton, Jan. 28, 1787; died June 11, 1855; Hon. Joseph Adams Pond, who died president of the Massachusetts Senate, Oct. 28, 1867, at the early age of forty; and Hon. Joseph Breck, florist and horticulturist, president of the Massachusetts Horticultural Society, and a State Senator, who died June 14, 1873, aged 78.

In 1688 Brighton's population consisted of twenty-eight families and thirty-five ratable polls. Her numbers at other periods have been as follows: —

1749 . . 290	1840 . . 1425	1870 . . 4967
1777 . . 326	1850 . . 2356	1875 . . 6200
1810 . . 608	1860 . . 3375	1880 . . 6693
1830 . . 972	1865 . . 3859	

Her valuation in 1865 was $3,812,694; in 1873, $14,548,531,—nearly four times as large. In 1865 the amount of capital invested in the three principal industries of Brighton was $390,942.

Besides the advantages she enjoys in common with the rest of the metropolis, Brighton is said to take the lead of every other town in the Commonwealth in the character of her roads, over which there is constant pleasure travel from Boston proper. Especially is this the case with the beautiful avenue surrounding the Cochituate Water Works at the Chestnut-Hill Reservoir; and since the elimination of the unpleasant slaughter-house odors that once pervaded her precincts, Brighton's many natural advantages and picturesque situations have made her generally known as one of the most attractive and desirable portions of the city for residences.

Francis S. Drake

CHAPTER XIX.

CHELSEA, REVERE, AND WINTHROP, FROM THE CLOSE OF THE PROVINCIAL PERIOD.

BY MELLEN CHAMBERLAIN,

Librarian of the Boston Public Library.

THE first volume of the Town Records of Chelsea ends with the year 1775, and the second opens with a transcript of the Declaration of Independence and the appended order of the Council, dated July 17, 1776, in which it was directed that the document should be printed and a copy sent to the ministers of each parish of every denomination within the State, to be read to their respective congregations at the close of divine service on the afternoon of the first Lord's day after its receipt, and thereafter to be delivered to the town clerk for record in the Town's Book, there to remain as a perpetual memorial. This record is followed, however, by several entries of an earlier date: —

"March 25, 1776. *Voted*, to choose a committee to estimate the damages the town, or any particular person or persons, hath sustained by the king's troops, or by part of the Continental army being stationed in said town.

"June 3, 1776. *Voted*, to instruct their representative, according to a Resolve of the House passed May 10th, that if the Honorable Congress should, for the safety of the said Colonies, declare them independent of the kingdom of Great Britain, they, the said inhabitants, will solemnly engage with their lives and fortunes to support them in the measure.

"Nov. 25. *Voted*, that they would not give their consent that the present House of Representatives of this State, together with the Council, should not[1] enact any form of government for this State. Also, *voted*, that they would choose a member for that business."

At this period, and for many years later, the principal settlement at Chelsea was within the present limits of Revere; and Winnisimmet and Pulling Point, as outlying districts, were obliged to clamor for their share of the public money. They were heard at the town-meeting, March 18, 1777, when it was —

[1] The patriotic and wise spirit of Phillips Payson is discernible in many votes entered on the Chelsea town records; but apparently they were seldom reduced to writing by himself.

"*Voted*, That the school be kept in the Body of the Town y^e^ whole of this present year. *Voted*, to allow Winnisimet and Pulling Point their proportionable part of the school money this present year, provided they lay it out in schooling of their Children, and that their proportion of money be drafted out of the Town's Treasury for the abov-said purpose."

The following votes, selected from many similar to be found in the Town Records, show that the inhabitants of Chelsea, during the Revolutionary period, were not without their share in the common anxiety, distress, and sacrifices: —

"May 26, 1777. *Voted*, no person be allowed to sell any sheep's wool out of the town till the inhabitants of the town be supplied with wool both for their own use and for the use of the soldiers.

"March 30, 1778. *Voted*, not to allow of an Inoculating Hospital for the small-pox to be set up in any house in the town of Chelsea.

"April 2, 1778. *Voted*, to draw money out of the town's treasury for to procure shirts, stockings, and shoes for the use and benefit of the town's quota of soldiers who are inlisted in the Continental army for three years, or during the war; and that each soldier be furnished with one shirt, one pair of stockings, and one pair of shoes, it being agreeable to a Resolve of the General Court of this State.

"The constitution and form of government for the State of Massachusetts agreed upon by the Convention of said State, Feb. 28, 1778, was read at this town-meeting for the town's consideration, to be acted upon at some future meeting." And, "May 29, the vote was called to see if the town would act upon the constitution and form of government; and the town voted by yeas and nays, and the vote passed in the negative by a great majority of the voters present.

"April 8, 1778. *Voted*, to have a smoke-house, or room to smoke persons in, at Winnisimmet Ferry, in order to prevent any person or persons coming out of the town of Boston from spreading the small-pox in any town in the country.

"*Voted*, not to be at any cost or charge to hire any person or persons to tend said smoke-house.

"Sept. 28, 1778. *Voted*, to give Lieut. Silas Clark the sum of eighty pounds, as a present in time past, for the support of his family, as a Continental officer in the army, considering the extraordinary price of the necessaries of life.

"*Voted*, to choose a committee of three persons to apply to the Great and General Court to get an abatement of Chelsea's State tax."

But notwithstanding their distress they voted, Dec. 17, 1778, to give to the Rev. Mr. Phillips Payson the sum of six hundred pounds lawful money, as a consideration for his support on account of the extraordinary prices of the necessaries of life. This vote called forth an affectionate and touching letter from their beloved pastor, which is entered on the records of the town.

The formation of a State constitution engaged a share of their attention; and they voted, Aug. 2, 1779, and chose Captain Jonathan Green "a delegate to meet at Cambridge, the first day of September next, in order to frame a constitution, or form of government, agreeably to a resolve of the General

Court the fifteenth of June last past;" and at the same meeting they chose Lieutenant Thomas Pratt, Samuel Sprague, and Joseph Green as a committee to instruct the town's delegate to the convention. It was also voted, "that the committee of correspondence take care that the Articles of Convention [respecting Burgoyne's army] be strictly complied with."

When the draft of the Constitution was laid before the people, May 9, 1780, a committee, of which Rev. Phillips Payson was chairman, was chosen to consider the same and "make remarks." June 1 the town met, according to the adjournment, and took up the business of the warrant: —

"Then *voted* to accept of the Declaration of Rights by yeas and nays, — eleven yeas and one nay; with this amendment, — p. 12, article 16, add: 'But as its freedom is not such as to exempt the printer or printers from being answerable for false, defamatory, and abusive publication.' *Voted*, to accept the name of this Commonwealth, — Massachusetts. *Voted*, to accept the form of government with the amendment, by yeas and nays, — eleven yeas and one nay. Alterations and corrections in the form of government: First, that all shall be voters for a Representative, Senators, Governor, etc., that pay taxes and are twenty-one years of age. Secondly, that the words 'order' and 'direct,' in the paragraphs respecting the Governor and Council, be changed for the words 'consult' and 'advise.' Thirdly, that the scheme of rotation be adopted in the principal department of government. Fourthly, that the clergy be exempted from all offices in the civil department. Fifthly, that in page 18, l. 24, the words 'at the least' be blotted out. Sixthly, that in page 22, add at the bottom, 'excepting vacancies by the choice of councillors.' Seventhly, that no person shall be a member of Congress for this State unless he possesses a right of freehold, an estate sufficient to qualify him for a seat in the Senate double to a Senator. Eighthly, in page twenty, add, 'or in the town clerk's absence, in the presence of the selectmen only.' *Voted*, if our delegate, Capt. Jonathan Green, shall not be able to procure these alterations and corrections, we leave it to his option to vote in Convention, by the best of his judgment, either for or against [the] frame of Government that shall be finally obtained in the honorable Convention, without referring of it again to the people at large."

At the town-meeting, Sept. 4, 1780, called to elect officers for the new government, twenty votes were cast for John Hancock for governor, and one for James Bowdoin. Benjamin Greenleaf had nineteen votes for the office of lieut.-governor. Jonathan Green was the first representative to the General Court under the Constitution.

But a change in the form of government did not bring about a change in the circumstances of the people. The war continued, and it is piteous to read the almost frantic, and sometimes ludicrous, efforts made by the town to fill their quota. Some of the votes are as follows: —

"Jan. 4, 1781. *Voted*, raised, and granted the sum of twenty thousand pounds, to be assessed on the polls and estates in the town of Chelsea, for the purchase of beef for the army, agreeably to a Resolve of the General Assembly of this State.

"Then *voted*, raised, and granted one thousand Spanish mill dollars as a bounty to eight soldiers that shall enlist into the Continental service for three years, or during the war.

"Then *voted* to choose a committee of three persons to lay out said money in hireing the eight soldiers as cheap as they could."

The meeting adjourned to the fifteenth, and thence to the twenty-ninth of January, when they

"*Voted*, to give to eight soldiers that should enlist into the Continental service for three years, or during the war, to have eight ealves a-piece, raised and kept, and to be delivered to each of them at the end of three years.

"*Voted*, that if the Committee should agree to give more than 125 dollars to any other men, then the town voted to give Sam[ll] Cheever more. The meeting then adjourned to Feb. 7th, when it was decided to leave the hiring of soldiers with the Committee to get them in the best manner they could, with stock or money."

The vote of the town for a bounty of too many calves of undiscriminated sex, and too little money, seems to have failed of the desired effect, and led to a special modification of terms on the first of March, as appears in the following vote: —

"To give John Sack one Hundred Hard Dollars and four Hefer Calves, to be kept and to be delivered to him at three years' old, for a Bounty for his Listing into the Continental service for three years for the town of Chelsea, and to pay him down 70 Hard Dollars or the exchange, and the Remainder to be paid to him or his order when call[ed] for by him."

This proposition appears to have been accepted, and led to certain votes of the town three years later: —

"Jan. 17, 1784. *Voted*, not to give John Syckes thirty Dollars in lieu of two of the heffers that the town owe to him. *Voted*, to Reconsider said last vote relative to said heffers. *Voted*, to give said John Syckes thirty Dollars in lieu of two of the heffers or cows that the town of Chelsea owe to him. *Voted*, to raise thirty Dollars to pay to the said John Syckes in lieu of said two cows or heffers that the town owe to him. *Voted*, to raise thirty Dollars to pay for two cows for said John Syckes. *Voted*, to choose a Committee to by said two cows."

As the war drew to a close, the financial difficulties of the town seemed to increase. At the March meeting in 1781 it was voted to raise £11,836 to defray the town charges. This was in the depreciated currency of the day, and seems not to have proved satisfactory; for in September of the same year it was determined to raise £150 in gold and silver money, to be assessed on the polls and estates. This sum, if raised, appears to have been insufficient; for in the January following they voted twenty-five dollars for the same purpose. But the vote was followed by this cry of anguish: "*Voted*, that they think they are almost Duble taxed to other adjasent towns;" and they chose a committee to petition the General Court for the abatement of the taxes. And this state of their affairs led them the next year, July 22, 1783, to choose a committee of five, — of whom the Rev.

Phillips Payson was one, — to address the town of Boston on the subject of reunion. But the citizens of that town evinced no more inclination to pay the debts of Chelsea than have their unfeeling successors on two similar invitations, now within legal memory.

"Jan. 3, 1782. The town voted to instruct their representative to do the best of his abilities to retain the fishery to the Northern States, if there should be a treaty for peace; and

"May 12, 1783. That, in their opinion, it was utterly incompatible with the dignity and safety of the Commonwealth, that any of those persons that justly come under the denomination of Refugees should ever be admitted to the privilege of citizenship among them; and their representative was instructed to act in conformity with this vote in the General Court."

Not long after the close of the war the people of Chelsea found themselves involved in a renewed contest for the estate of Governor Bellingham at Winnisimmet, which had raged with varying fortunes for nearly thirty years, and ended only in 1787 with the defeat of the town. This result subjected the community to the expenses of a protracted law-suit, and also to the necessity of accounting for the rents and profits of such parts of the Bellingham estates as had been in their possession between 1776 and 1787.

The venerable Dr. Phillips Payson died Jan. 11, 1801, and was succeeded in the pastoral office by Rev. Joseph Tuckerman, who was ordained Nov. 4, of the same year, and ministered to the people just a quarter of a century, — preaching his farewell sermon Nov. 4, 1826. Dr. Tuckerman immediately began his service in the "Ministry at Large," in Boston, to which place he soon removed with his family. He died at Havana, April 20, 1840, and his life and distinguished services were duly commemorated by Dr. Channing in a discourse delivered Jan. 31, 1841.

For some years after 1830 Rumney Marsh, Pulling Point, and Winnisimmet maintained their relative importance, — the principal settlement, meeting-house, and town offices being at the first-named of these localities. But the time was approaching when Winnisimmet, instead of being the least in population and wealth, should become the greatest. For two hundred years that precinct had consisted of four great farms, severally now known by the names of their most recent individual proprietors, as the Williams, Shurtleff, Cary, and Carter farms; and the only houses at Winnisimmet — apart from those connected with the Ferry — were the mansions and farm houses attached to these estates. In 1831 the Williams Farm, with the Ferry franchise, was purchased by trustees, who in 1833 conveyed their estate to the Winnisimmet Company, then recently incorporated. This company became the owner of the Shurtleff Farm in 1835; and, by the purchase of several lesser estates, were sole proprietors of a large and compact territory which was carefully resurveyed in 1836, and divided into house lots of convenient size. With increased ferry facilities and the sale of these house lots, a considerable village rapidly grew up, which, March

19, 1846, became the town of Chelsea, — Rumney Marsh and Pulling Point being erected into a separate town by the name of North Chelsea. These were divided March 27, 1852, when Pulling Point was incorporated as the town of Winthrop. Chelsea became a city March 13, 1857; and the name of North Chelsea was changed to Revere, March 24, 1871.

Within a few years past Revere and Winthrop have attracted attention as convenient and salubrious places for summer residence, and the localities of Ocean Spray and Beachmont, bordering on the sea, have grown into considerable villages.

The relative growth of these towns between 1875 and 1880 will be shown by the State and United States Census, respectively, of those years. Chelsea, 20,737; 21,785. Revere, 1,603; 2,263. Winthrop, 627; 1,043. The construction of the Narrow-Gauge Railroad has contributed largely to these results.

CHAPTER XX.

THE PRESS AND LITERATURE OF THE LAST HUNDRED YEARS.

BY CHARLES A. CUMMINGS.

OF the five newspapers which were printed in Boston when the war of the Revolution broke out, only two remained in existence at its close. The *Massachusetts Spy* had been at once removed to the safer town of Worcester, where it maintained an honorable and useful existence, not only through the Revolutionary struggle, but continuing even to the present day. The *Boston Gazette* alone from its old office hailed the return of peace, and the triumph of the good cause which it had so bravely aided. Its chief rival at this time was the *Boston Chronicle*, which had been established in 1776 by Powars & Willis as a weekly paper, which had been printed straight through the war, and which found itself, when the war ended, dividing with the *Gazette* such reputation and prosperity as the press of those days was competent to achieve. Several competitors had indeed entered the field, but none of them was able to keep itself alive for any considerable time. The *Independent Ledger*, published on Mondays by Draper & Folsom, was first issued June 15, 1778. Buckingham says, "The latest number of this paper which I have seen is dated Dec. 29, 1783; whether it was continued later I have not been able to ascertain." The partnership of Edes & Gill having been dissolved, and the *Boston Gazette* remaining the property of Edes, Gill began on May 30, 1776, a new weekly paper called the *Continental Journal and Weekly Advertiser*. Gill died in 1785, having previously sold out his newspaper which apparently soon followed him. There was also the *American Herald*, published for six or seven years previous to 1788 by Edward Eveleth Powars.

A more formidable competitor than these ephemeral sheets appeared during the first year of peace, in *The Massachusetts Centinel and Republican Journal*, published every Wednesday and Saturday by Warden & Russell "at their office in Marlborough Street," and of which the first number appeared on March 24, 1784. The long life of this celebrated newspaper; its management for more than forty years by its original editor, Major Ben. Russell; and the vigor and constancy with which it maintained the principles of public policy which were held by the great majority of well-to-do citizens of Massachusetts and New England during these early years of the repub-

lic, — have made its name more famous than that of any of its numerous contemporaries, from which, however, there was at first little either in its appearance or its contents to distinguish it. Its size was, after the first two years, the same as that of the other papers; and the general aspect of its columns, and the prevailing style of its articles, were not materially different. It may then, since a detailed account of all these newspapers would be both tedious and profitless, be taken as a fair specimen of what was in those days regarded as a satisfactory newspaper. The first number contained naturally the appeal of the publishers "To the candid Publick," [1] which occupied the whole of the first page. The remainder was made up of an unimportant extract or two from "late London papers," the latest bearing date three months back; an official copy of a resolve passed by the Legislature; a summary of domestic news, very barren indeed; "food for sentimentalists," being a moving history of a father rescued from impending ruin by the devotion of a son; a highly artificial poem on "The Newspaper;" a facetious anecdote; a little shipping news; and two advertisements, — one of "Painters' Oils and Colors," by Grant & Dashwood, and another of spelling-books, etc. by Warden & Russell. That is all. The remotest village in the South or West would to-day throw aside such a newspaper as worthless. Yet the publishers in their next issue find it difficult to express their gratitude for the extraordinary favor with which it has been received. "Our hearty thanks but feebly speak the gratitude of our breasts. As a number of our customers were disappointed in not receiving the first number (a sufficiency not being printed to supply the demand), we shall as soon as possible strike off a second edition. As we shall adorn the *Centinel* with the most delicious sentimental sustenance we can obtain, as well the production of our soil as exotick, those who would wish to be supplied with the first numbers to bind up can thus be gratified."

[1] After a high flight of rhetoric declaring that the chief duty of the hour was to second the cherub peace "in shedding her delectable blessings over this New World," and that the surest way to accomplish this end, and at the same time "to obtain a competency for our support," was to set on foot "a Free, Uninfluenced Newspaper," the publishers proceed with the prospectus of their undertaking, as follows: —

"Conditions.

"1. This paper shall be printed with legible type on good paper, to contain four quarto pages, demi.

"2. The price of this paper will be twelve shillings the year, one quarter to be paid on subscribing. If, agreeably to the custom in the cities of London, New York, & Philadelphia, the subscriber should choose to pay per number, the price will be Two Pence.

"3. The papers in the town of Boston shall be delivered to the Subscribers as early as possible on publication days.

"4. Advertisements shall be inserted at as low a price as is demanded by any of their brethren in the art, and continued, if desired, in Six numbers.

"5. Gentlemen in the Country may be supplied with this Paper at the above price (postage excepted), which is cheaper than any other papers if the advantage of receiving them twice in the week is considered.

"The publishers engage to use every effort to obtain the most scrutinous circumspection in collecting whatever may be thought of public utility or private amusement. Variety shall be courted in all its shapes, — in the importance of public information, in the sprightliness of mirth; in the playful levity of imagination, in the just severity of satire, in the vivacity of ridicule, in the luxuriance of poetry, and in the simplicity of truth. We shall examine the regulations of office with candor, approve with pleasure, or condemn with boldness. *Uninfluenced by Party, we aim only to be just.*

"The assistance of the learned, the judicious, and the curious is solicited. Productions of public utility, however severe, if consistent with truth shall be admitted, and the modest correspondent may depend on the strictest secrecy. Reservoirs will be established in public houses for the reception of information, whether foreign, local, or poetical.

"Anxious to deserve, they hope a display of that patronage and assistance which the people of these States are celebrated for bestowing on the efforts of young beginners. And finally, if their abilities be inadequate, it will at least be some recompense that such as they have shall be exerted with candour."

"W. Warden.
"B. Russell."

The *Centinel* was from the first peculiar in separating its contents under various highly imaginative headings, which partook of the ambitious and sophomoric flavor of most of the matter which appeared under them. Thus the poetical corner, which was a constant feature of the paper, was headed in the earliest numbers "Sentimental Repast." By the eighth number a

Benj Russell.

more elegant title had occurred to the editor. It was now called "The Helicon Reservoir." Some weeks later this was again changed to "Sentimental Sustenance." Under this head the *Deserted Village* of Goldsmith was published, running through a dozen numbers or so.[1] The "Castalian Fount."

[1] But the poetry is not often of this order. It is more commonly prefaced by a note like this: "MESSRS PRINTERS, — Your admission of the following in the *Centinel* will implant an agreeable sensation in the breast of a female reader." Then follows a highly sentimental poem beginning,

and the "Cabinet of Apollo" were successively chosen to please the uneasy and fastidious taste of the editor. Under the heading, "Entertainment for the Disciples of Zeno," a department was established containing brief anecdotes, in most of which it would be difficult to discover the qualities which distinguish the stoic philosophy. "Preparation for Sunday" was a department of every Saturday's issue, containing some short extract from a religious book or a sermon. In time the editor, becoming dissatisfied with this heading, made this announcement: "As under that head the great and important subject is too much circumscribed, we propose continuing to teach the principles of piety and morality under the title of 'The Moral Entertainer,' and we hope much benefit may be derived therefrom."

It is quite clear from a glance at these early numbers of the *Centinel* that no reason existed in the nature of things for the establishment of such a newspaper. If newspapers are indeed the mirror of the times which produce them, how portentous was the dulness of this little town! The excitement of the Revolution had died away, leaving a reaction in which the exhaustion consequent on a war in which the whole people had engaged, was not mitigated by the abundant resources or the varied opportunities of a great people. The Province no longer existed; the Nation was not yet created. Trade was prostrate; manufactures were not yet dreamed of; communication was slow and for half the year difficult. A sort of apathy seemed for the moment to possess the minds of the people. These were not the conditions under which a newspaper was likely to make itself either interesting or useful. For the first two years accordingly the *Centinel* struggled for existence; and the same may perhaps be said of its contemporaries. The political questions which a few years later were to divide the people into parties had not yet arisen, and the occasions for newspaper comment or criticism on public affairs were extremely infrequent. A gentle breeze of interest can be seen now and then to have moved over the slumberous surface of Boston life. During this first year a sort of social club, composed of ladies and gentlemen of good position in society, was holding what were called "tea assemblies" at stated intervals at Concert Hall,[1] at which the entertainment was made up of "music, dancing, tea, coffee, chocolate, cards, wine, negus, punch, and lemonade." A severe writer in the *Centinel*, signing himself "Observer," took occasion to criticise without reserve the proceedings and manners of this club, — of which the name, "*Sans Souci*, or Free and Easy," did, it must be confessed, rather invite remark, — declaring that it was "an assembly totally repugnant to virtue, ... throwing aside every necessary restraint; those being esteemed the politest who are the most careless," etc. In the same issue of the paper an advertisement appeared to this effect: "A new Farce. On Monday next will be published

— "When Damon asked me for a kiss," etc., and signed "Clorinda." To which the gallant editor appends this approving note: "Clorinda has our hearty thanks for this effusion of her pen. It is our wish to rescue the fair sex from the obscurity in which the timidity of female delicacy would shelter itself, and to animate the female breast to catch at the laurels due to their vivacity and their merits."

[1] [See Vol. II. p. xvii. — Ed.]

'*Sans Souci*, alias Free and Easy, or an Evening's Peep into a Polite Circle.' An entire new entertainment in three acts." In the next number of the *Centinel* the editor takes occasion to state that he has been called upon by Mr. Samuel Jarvis, a member of the *Sans Souci*, and assaulted. This is the opportunity for a long and rhetorical article, occupying nearly the whole paper, on the enormity of this "infringement of the liberty of the press," and the inflexible determination of the injured editor to maintain the position of the *Centinel* as "a Free, Uninfluenced Newspaper, in spite of the threats of sanguinary assassins." The quarrel is taken up by the other newspapers, and communications on both sides are rained upon the fortunate public for some weeks.

A more reasonable excitement was occasioned a little later by the visit of several foreign agents or factors, chiefly from New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, selling the goods of English merchants and manufacturers. Not only the patriotism but the business instincts of the town took offence at this new and most unwelcome enterprise. The indignation and alarm grew the more rapidly, perhaps, from the absence of any law which could be invoked to abate the nuisance; until at length the inflammatory writing in the newspapers culminated in an excited public meeting in Faneuil Hall, at which the merchants and traders pledged themselves to have no dealings with the offensive strangers. The proposal to restore the Tory refugees in the Provinces and elsewhere to their rights as citizens of the United States, excited almost as much anger and alarm as the visits of the factors, and with less excuse.

The watchful jealousy of a people which had but just freed themselves from the restraints and vexations of arbitrary and aristocratic rule, was quick to take alarm at dangers which from our safe distance seem most trivial. The institution of the Cincinnati seems to us as innocent of harm as any association of gentlemen united by community of patriotic memories and associations could well be. Grave danger was, however, at its inception perceived to lurk under this dignified organization, and some of the newspapers, among which the *Chronicle* was the most emphatic, attacked the society with violence. "The institution of the Cincinnati," said one of the correspondents of the *Chronicle*, "is designed to establish a complete and permanent personal distinction between the numerous military dignitaries of their corporation and the whole remaining body of the people, who will be styled Plebeians through the community." These sentiments were shared by the people to such an extent that the citizens of Cambridge, by a vote in town-meeting, instructed their representative in the Legislature to use his best influence to insure the suppression of this society. The *Centinel* poured oil on the waters by reminding the alarmists "that his Excellency, George Washington, Esq., is president of that society, — a circumstance that greatly recommends it."

The Legislature of 1785 passed an act laying a duty of two thirds of a penny upon every newspaper, and a penny on almanacs, all of which were

to be stamped. The words "stamp act" had a horrid sound in the ears of the men of the Revolution, and so violent an opposition to the proposed tax was excited throughout the State that the act was repealed during the same session, and another was substituted laying a duty on all advertisements, — sixpence on each insertion. This was not, in general, much more favorably received, though the *Centinel*, perhaps because its advertisements were then extremely few, excused the new tax on the ground that it "contributed thousands to the exigencies of the State."[1] The *Centinel* was increased in size at the end of the second year, but the conduct of the paper showed no essential improvement. The matter was still trivial. The style was still ambitious and uneasy. The communications, for the most part under grotesque and affected signatures, — as Tantarabogus, Desideratum, Whackum, Whackum Secundus, Moralibus, Mulier, Slap-dash, Publicola, Agricola, and the like, — are generally marked by turgid and pompous rhetoric, savage and brutal personal abuse, and ridiculous attempts at satire, — almost never by calm discussion of any subject.

During the first months of 1787 we find some lively accounts of the progress and ignominious collapse of Shays' Rebellion; and later in the same year interesting reports of the proceedings of the convention in Philadelphia for the adoption of the Federal Constitution. In January of the next year the Massachusetts convention for ratifying the Constitution was held in the meeting-house in Long Lane, and Mr. Russell then made what was probably the first systematic attempt at reporting for any Boston newspaper. The speeches seem to have been, on the whole, very well reported, and the proceedings filled the greater part of every issue of the paper for four weeks. An amusing tribute occurs at the close of one of the reports. "We came in," says the editor, "while the Hon. Judge Dana was speaking; but captivated by the fire, the pathos, and the superior eloquence of his speech, we forgot we came to take minutes, and thought to hear alone was our duty. Our memory will not enable us to do it justice, but we shall attempt a feeble sketch of it."[2]

[1] The *Boston Gazette* thus complained of the burden of the tax, and thus evaded it: —

"While the newspapers of other States are crowded with advertisements (free of duty) those of this State are almost destitute thereof, which justly occasions the oppressed printers of those shackled presses to make their separate complaints, as many do, owing to their being prohibited advertising in their own papers their own books and stationery, without incurring a penalty therefor. We, for the same reason that our brother typographers use, forbear publishing that Bibles, Testaments, Psalters, Spelling-books, Primers, Almanacks, &c., besides Stationery and all kinds of blanks, may be had at No. 42 Cornhill. The duty on advertisements also prevents our publishing that we have lately reprinted an excellent Moral Discourse, entitled 'The Shortness and afflictions of Human Life, illustrated;' for, the price of said book being but eight pence, it will take away the profits of too many, and perhaps encourage government to continue this burthen." — Buckingham's *Specimens of Newspaper Literature.*

[2] In a memorandum quoted by Buckingham (vol. ii. p. 49), Russell says: —

"I had never studied stenography, nor was there any person then in Boston who understood reporting. The presiding officer of the convention sat in the deacon's seat under the pulpit. I took the pulpit for my reporting desk, and a very good one it was. I succeeded well enough in this, my first effort, to give a tolerably fair report in my next paper; but the puritanical notions had not entirely faded away, and I was voted out of the pulpit. A stand was fitted up for me in

Russell's enthusiasm for the new Constitution, and for the "more perfect union" of States which it secured, was strong and enduring, and was the foundation of the steady improvement which may be observed in the *Centinel* from this time onward, and of the full measure of success which followed it. The other papers hailed the new birth of the nation, as in duty bound, with more or less of cordiality; but the steady development of national feeling, the steady consolidation of national power, was not witnessed by all with the same pride and confidence. So long as the issue of the Revolutionary struggle remained undetermined, the press of the country was united by one controlling sentiment, — hatred of Great Britain; and by one controlling purpose, — the successful termination of the war. When the stress of the exigency was past, and the war itself began to recede from men's thoughts, this harmony was disturbed, and the passions and prejudices of men grew more and more fruitful with every year. The separation into parties was not fully accomplished until Washington had retired from public life; but it was already beginning as early as the adoption of the Federal compact, and a man was on one side or another, according as his political sympathies inclined him towards England or France. The frightful spectacle of the French Revolution was now about opening. A considerable portion of the press of the United States followed and recorded its excesses with approval and even with admiration, as inspired by the same love of liberty which had just triumphed on this side the ocean.[1] This was the beginning of the Republican party, which a little later was compacted by a real or pretended fear of centralization and monarchy, as the natural outgrowth of the new Constitution. The Federalists were accused of ingratitude towards France and of subserviency to Great Britain; and the Federal leaders of cherishing aristocratic and monarchical ideas. The *Boston Gazette*, still managed by Benjamin Edes, was perhaps the most ardent friend of the French Revolution, and the most strenuous opponent of the Federal Constitution and the leaders of the Federal party. The *Chronicle*, less pronounced in its opposition to the Constitution, became not less violent in its abuse of the Federal administration. Its opposition to the Alien and Sedition laws, passed by Congress in 1798, was so violent as to cause the arrest of the editor and his trial. But neither party held the monopoly of violence. Frantic vituperation is the most common characteristic of the political communications in most of the newspapers of the time.[2] Such flowers of rhetoric as "native

another place, and I proceeded with my reporting." [See Mr. Lodge's chapter in this volume. — ED.]

[1] Cobbett said in 1796: "There is not a single action of the French Revolutionists but has been justified and applauded in our public papers, and many of them in our public assemblies. Anarchy has its open advocates. It is a truth that no one will deny, that the newspapers of this country have become its scourge." — *Porcupine's Works*, ii. 223.

[2] As early as 1782, Franklin, writing from Passy to Francis Hopkinson, says: —

"You do well to avoid being concerned in the species of personal abuse, so scandalously common in our newspapers that I am afraid to lend one of them here until I have examined and laid aside such as would disgrace us, and subject us among strangers to a reflection like that used by a gentleman in a coffee-house to two quarrellers, who, after a mutually free use of the words 'rogue,' 'villain,' 'rascal,' 'scoundrel,' etc., seemed

blackguardism," "spurious exotic," "quill-driving animal," "Jacobin vermin," "mud, filth, and venom," "diabolical malice," and the like flourish on every page. In spite, however, of this ugly feature, the improvement in the general conduct of the principal papers was marked and steady. The march of events, both at home and abroad, was too imposing to permit the editors to limit their interest and attention to the trivial and personal details which had formerly absorbed them. The foreign intelligence was now received with greater regularity and frequency, and became an important feature of all the newspapers. Russell's enterprise was conspicuous both in collecting this intelligence and in digesting it for publication. He had the habit of visiting all vessels, on their arrival from foreign ports, to procure the latest news. At the office of the *Centinel* regular files of the *Moniteur* were kept, which brought Talleyrand and Louis Phillippe as frequent visitors to the office during their stay in Boston. A gold snuff-box from the former and an atlas from the latter were memorials long preserved by the editor; and one of them, at least, was of constant service in preparing his summaries of the military news from the Continent. The proceedings and laws of Congress[1] and of the State Legislature, reports of the meetings of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, an occasional debate in Parliament, and more frequent and copious intelligence from other American cities mark the steady growth of the newspaper in importance and interest.

The *Boston Gazette* expired in 1798. It was the last newspaper which went back to the days preceding the Revolution; and its venerable editor, Benjamin Edes, took leave of the public in a pathetic if somewhat high-flown farewell address. Its place as the ultra-Republican organ (the *Chronicle* being generally regarded by the more violent Republicans as not quite pronounced enough in its hostility to the Federalists) was filled the next year by a new paper, the *Constitutional Telegraphe;* which, however, unable to show any reason for its existence, lasted but about three years, its editor following the example of Edes with a farewell address dated "Boston Gaol, March 30, 19th day of imprisonment," having been condemned to a detention of three months for a libel on one of the judges of the Supreme Court. The *Telegraphe* was but one of several papers which the ill-considered enthusiasm of political parties set on foot in the last years of the century, which

as if they would refer their dispute to him. 'I know nothing of you or your affairs,' said he; '*I only perceive that you know one another!*'" Franklin's *Works*, x. 461.

[1] Concerning the publication by the *Centinel* of the laws of Congress, Buckingham has the following, which is creditable alike to the printer and the government: —

"While Congress was holding its first session, Russell wrote to the department of state and offered to publish gratuitously all the laws and other official documents, the country being then almost or quite bankrupt. All laws and other papers emanating from the various departments of the government were accordingly transmitted to him and were published 'by authority.' At the end of several years he was called upon for his bill. It was made out and, in compliance with the pledge, was receipted. On being informed of the fact, General Washington said: 'This must not be. When Mr. Russell offered to publish the laws without pay, we were poor. It was a generous offer. We are now able to pay our debts. This is a debt of honor, and must be discharged.' A few days after, Mr. Russell received a check for $7,000, the full amount of his bill." — *Specimens of Newspaper Literature*, ii. 59.

lived a few months or a few years, and died leaving no sign. One of these, the *Federal Orrery*, established in 1794 by Thomas Paine, — an enthusiastic young Federalist just graduated from Cambridge, from whose accomplishments much was expected, — created a temporary excitement in Boston by a series of papers entitled "Remarks on the Jacobiniad," in which an imaginary poem was reviewed, with extracts, accompanied by satirical criticisms on prominent Republicans. Paine was assaulted in State Street for the publication of these papers, which were attributed — whether rightly or not is, we believe, not known — to the Rev. J. S. J. Gardiner, assistant rector of Trinity Church, who was attacked without mercy in the columns of the *Chronicle* and the *Gazette*. Paine was of an expansive literary turn, and by no means confined himself to his newspaper. His patriotic songs achieved a national reputation, and yielded extraordinary sums to their author, sums unexampled in that day and for many a day after. The most famous of these was "Adams and Liberty," — a flamboyant lyric in ten verses in the metre of the "Star Spangled Banner," written at the request of the Massachusetts Charitable Fire Society, and from the sale of which Paine is said to have received more than $750. Perhaps even more remarkable was the popularity of a poem in the heroic metre, delivered before the Phi Beta Kappa Society in 1797, which is declared to have brought its author not less than $1,200.

Russell's *Gazette* was a semi-weekly newspaper established in 1795, strongly Federalist, and a ferocious enemy of France, Jefferson, and the Republican newspapers. It had also its special vanity as an elegant critic and patron of the theatre, then newly established in Boston. Under one ownership and another it survived as late as 1830, always holding its place as a prominent and influential journal.

Another newspaper of much influence at this time was the *Massachusetts Mercury*, established in 1793 by Young & Etheridge; better known by its later title of the *Palladium*, adopted in 1801, when it passed under the control of Warren Dutton as editor, and became the vehicle through which some of the ablest writers of the Federal party addressed the public. Conspicuous among these writers was Fisher Ames, whose contributions were frequent through all the years which intervened between his retirement from public life and his death in 1808.

With the election of Jefferson in 1800 the strife between the two parties took new vigor and fiercer hatred. The history of the newspaper press for the next fifteen years is the history of this strife, and of the suspicions and slanders, the accusations and retorts, of the chiefs of the hostile camps.[1]

[1] John Adams, writing from Quincy, in 1811, to Benjamin Rush, says: — "If I am to judge by the newspapers and pamphlets that have been published in America for twenty years past, I should think that both parties believed me the meanest villain in the world." (*Works*, ix. 636.) And Jefferson writes to Dr. Walter Jones much in the same spirit, but with even stronger disgust: "I deplore with you the putrid state into which our newspapers have passed, and the malignity, the vulgarity, and the mendacious spirit of those who write for them; and I enclose you a recent sample, the production of a New England judge, as a proof of the abyss of

Probably there never was a time in any country when the newspapers of a single small town were enriched with the political contributions of such a number of men of undisputed ability, force of character, and patriotism. Fisher Ames in the *Palladium*, James Sullivan in the *Chronicle*, George Cabot in the *Centinel*, J. Q. Adams, Christopher Gore, John Lowell, Timothy Pickering, Levi Lincoln, William Plumer, and many more of the foremost men of an age rich in political vigor continued to fill the newspapers with those unique compositions, half essay, half harangue, which exerted an incalculable influence in holding the people of Massachusetts and New England to the losing cause of the party whose sun had set when the administration of John Adams came to an end.

The writers of the *Centinel* opposed without discrimination every measure of importance originating with the administrations of Jefferson and Madison. The embargo was characterized as "a bold stroke to starve a people into democracy." The war with Great Britain was declared to be carried on "to afford encouragement to British, Irish, and Jersey runaway sailors to enter on board American vessels, and then to be PROTECTED while they are underworking the native-born American seamen and navigators, and thereby taking the bread from the mouths of their wives and children. This is the great object of this war."

Whatever may have been the object of the war, there can be at the present day no doubt that one of its most marked results was the extinction of the absurd jealousies and hatreds of the past twenty years, the union of the best men of both parties in the support of Monroe, and the inauguration of the "era of good feeling," — a phrase, by the way, which Russell first used on the occasion of the President's visit to Boston in 1817.

That the asperities of party politics had been the meat and drink of the two great party newspapers it would perhaps be too much to say, but the *Chronicle* survived the reconciliation only two years. In 1819 it was sold to the owners of the *Boston Patriot*, and united with that paper. It had managed to live for fifty years, and its influence had been very great. Its great antagonist, the *Centinel*, was also growing rusty with age and peace, but held out yet another ten years under Russell's management, though in a visibly declining condition; until in 1828 it was sold to Adams & Hudson, who published it until 1840, when it was purchased by the proprietors of the *Daily Advertiser*, and was heard of no more. The day of personal newspapers was passing away. While the matter which filled them was small in amount and of no great variety, they were managed without much difficulty by a single editor, who was to all intents and purposes the newspaper. With the growth of business and population, the enlargement of the life of the town, and the multiplication of interests and of topics, the simplicity of such newspaper work became obsolete. In these vastly changed conditions, also, the

degradation into which we are fallen. As a vehicle of information and a curb on our functionaries, they have rendered themselves useless by forfeiting all title to belief." — *Works*, iv. 234. [See further, on these political antagonisms, Mr. Lodge's chapter in this volume. — ED.]

semi-weekly issue became inadequate to the needs of the business world; but it was curiously long before a daily newspaper found a footing in Boston. Attempts were made in this direction as early as 1796 and 1798. The *Polar Star and Boston Daily Advertiser* appeared in the former year, and the *Federal Gazette and Daily Advertiser* in the latter. The one lived six months, the other three. Boston was for once far behind her sister cities in enterprise. The *American Daily Advertiser* had been established in Philadelphia as early as 1784, and the *New York Daily Advertiser* the next year; but it was not until 1813 that the first daily made good its claim to existence in Boston. The *Boston Daily Advertiser*, of which the first number appeared on March 3 of that year, was published by W. W. Clapp, and edited by Horatio Bigelow, who says in his salutatory that the city of New York is now supporting, "besides monthly, weekly, and semi-weekly publications, eight daily newspapers." It was not surprising that the commercial needs of a rapidly growing port like Boston should require a daily newspaper, and the space occupied by advertisements from the first number attests the reasonableness of the new undertaking. Mr. Bigelow remained the editor scarcely more than a year. On the 6th of April, 1814, the paper passed from his hands into those of Nathan Hale, whose conspicuous ability, energy, good judgment, and good taste rapidly raised the *Advertiser* to a high rank among the leading newspapers of the country.

Mr. Hale's introduction of himself upon taking charge of the *Advertiser* was interesting as showing his sense of the inadequacy of the newspapers of that day, and of the responsibility justly attaching to an editor.[1] It was plain, explicit, modest, and manly. He lived to make good all that he undertook. From the first number the *Advertiser* was distinguished by brief comments on prominent topics, having a candid and manly air, and always temperate and just. From these grew the regular "leaders," more full and more considered year by year, which mark the advance from the newspapers of the earlier days, whose commentaries were communicated by writers not connected with the publication, and partook too commonly of the nature of personal criticism.

From the establishment of the morning daily, the old semi-weekly papers became more and more obsolete. The *Chronicle*, the *Gazette*, the *Palladium*,

[1] "Almost the total amount," he says, "of the reading of at least one half the people of this country, and a great part of the reading of a large portion of the other half, is from the daily or weekly newspapers of the country. Many of these readers rely solely upon the amount offered by a single paper. . . . Thus it is manifest that the office of an editor is one of great importance and responsibility; and accordingly we find that if we have any striking traits of national character, their origin may be clearly discerned in our universal relish for newspaper reading, and in the general character of the newspaper which we read." He declares simply and frankly that "he is a Federalist; and if Federalism of the Boston stamp have any distinguishing marks, his is certainly of that impression. Such is his acquaintance with the character, motives, and wishes of the leading Federalist men, in New England in particular, that he places in them an unlimited confidence." He hopes to be able to satisfy the expectations of his readers in the matter of news, both foreign and domestic, as soon as he has become more familiar with the sources of intelligence and the means of collecting it. He promises to care for the mercantile interests of his readers, knowing that he must depend chiefly on merchants and traders for support. [See a further account of Mr. Hale in Mr. Adams's chapter in Vol. IV. — Ed.]

and finally the *Centinel* itself were successively absorbed by the *Advertiser*. Repeated enlargements in the size of the sheet were accompanied by corresponding expansion of its work and of its circulation.

The *Advertiser*, as Mr. Hale recognized, was essentially a business paper. Of its twenty-four columns frequently only two or three, seldom more than five, were given to what is known as reading matter. No notice was taken of theatres or concerts, though these were duly advertised in its columns.



There were no book notices, and no correspondence either foreign or domestic. Literature and art were alike ignored. As late even as 1833, when Charles Kemble and his brilliant daughter played their first engagement in Boston, the *Advertiser's* account of their first performances was limited to a single paragraph.[1]

On the other hand the political complexion of the paper was marked and distinct from the outset, and grew more and more emphatic as the issues between the Whig and Democratic parties became more clearly defined. It was a loyal and steadfast adherent of Webster, not only as the great exponent of Whig principles and Whig policy, but also during and after the embittered quarrel in which the splendid prestige of Webster was set against the growing and deepening public sentiment of New England and the North, and which left that great man without the support and without the confidence of the great body of his constituents.

The *Advertiser* was for eleven years the only daily paper published in Boston. But in 1824 Mr. Joseph Tinker Buckingham, who had for some years been the editor, as he was the founder, of the *New England Galaxy*, established a new daily, called the *Boston Courier*,[2] of which the only pronounced political principle was at first the necessity for a protective tariff, but which soon grew to be a very prominent and influential organ of the Whig party, and of its foremost statesman, Daniel Webster. More vivacious and discursive than the *Advertiser;* more hospitable to the ideas and the schemes of social and political reformers, and less exclusively devoted to the mercantile interests of the city, — its columns were frequently enriched with purely literary contributions from authors whose names have since become widely known. Its careful notices of new books and of theatrical performances, and its entertaining Washington correspondence were features then

[1] "Mr. Kemble appeared in *Hamlet* on Monday evening. His acting is chaste and dignified, and made a strong impression on his audience. Last evening Miss Kemble appeared in the character of Bianca in the tragedy of *Fazio*, and was enthusiastically received by a very crowded house. Mr. Kemble sustained that of Fazio with much power."

[2] "The first number was issued on March 2, 1824, with the encouragement of less than two hundred subscribers. There was then one daily paper in the city, and the attempt to establish another was thought to be a reckless experiment." — Buckingham's *Personal Memoirs, and Recollections of Editorial Life* (Boston: 1852), ii. p. 217.

of rare occurrence in any newspaper. It partook of the personal character and temperament of its founder and manager in much the same way that the *Centinel* had done a generation before, and was perhaps the last of the Boston newspapers which can be said to have exhibited this peculiarity. As the organization of a newspaper grows more complex, and calls for the labor and supervision of a larger corps of writers, it is as inevitable as it is desirable that the personality of the individual editor should disappear and be replaced by that of the journal. Mr. Buckingham retired from the management of the *Courier* in 1848, having been for thirty years one of the most conspicuous figures in the literary history of the city.

The increasing importance and population of Boston about the year 1830 greatly stimulated the creation of daily newspapers. The *Boston Post* was established in 1831 as a Democratic organ, and has continued to this day faithful to the varying fortunes of the Democratic party. The next year the two Whig papers were reinforced by a third, the *Boston Atlas*, which became a more pronounced organ than either the *Advertiser* or the *Courier;* and which, for twenty-five years not less constant in its party fealty than its contemporary and adversary the *Post*, did not long survive the dissolution of the Whig party. These were years when the political behavior of the people was not such as can be now looked back upon with complacency. It was with extreme slowness and reluctance that men were brought to acknowledge that anything was of more importance to the well-being of the nation than tariffs and cotton-mills and the protection of slave property. The party press did not help them to learn the lesson, and did its best, as must now be owned, to oppose and countervail the irresistible march of ideas and events which was pressing the nation swiftly to the crisis.[1] When the crisis had once arrived, and all the lesser doubts and tremors, the hopes of compromise, the deprecation of imprudent zeal, the pledges of this or that candidate, the defection of this or that place-holder; all the calculations, in short, of the political chess-board, were forgotten in face of the tremendous exigency, — the newspapers of Boston, like those of other cities, rose with the occasion; and, apart from a few disgraceful exceptions which need not be remembered here, served a nobler purpose in compacting and expressing the popular sentiment and will, and in strengthening the hands of the Government. The stimulus of the Civil War enlarged the scope of the great newspapers to a prodigious extent. The arrangements for the receipt of intelligence by telegraph were perfected by the Associated Press to a degree which would have been more gratifying had there been less frequent cause for suspecting the accuracy of the information. The multiplication of correspondents at important points; the necessity for detailed reports of everything said or done, or written or sung; the growth of the habit of "interviewing" any personage possessing even a momentary importance in the public eye, — do but indicate a few of the many directions in which the attention of newspaper managers must now be turned.

[1] [See James Freeman Clarke's chapter in the present volume. — Ed.]

Of the evening dailies the *Transcript*, established in 1830, and the *Journal*, in 1833, were the earliest. These were not political newspapers, but made themselves first of all purveyors of news, pure and simple, — the first named, which was for a while in the editorial charge of Epes Sargent, adding to this a certain distinction, maintained to the present day, as a dispenser of light and lively gossip and small-talk. Avoiding topics of weight upon which opinions were earnest, its many contributors amused their readers with harmless questions of fashion, of the weather, of the theatre, with watering-place correspondence, and copies of verses. More earnest matters mingled with all this, as the years went on and public affairs grew ever graver. The *Boston Traveller* was published as a weekly paper as early as 1825. In 1845 it became a daily, and completed the list of established and permanent daily newspapers of reputation. The growth of the penny press dates from about this time. The cheap dailies rapidly multiplied; and the *Herald*, *Times*, *Bee*, *Mail*, and others of the same stamp, substantially alike in their appearance and in the matter which filled their columns, found a large though fluctuating circulation. They were, however, in their nature ephemeral, and disappeared one after another, — with the exception of the *Times*, which was kept alive for twenty years, and the *Herald*, which maintained its ground with even greater persistency, until, reinforced a dozen years ago in capital, intelligence, and character, but retaining still the characteristics which secure to the cheap newspaper its wide distribution, it has taken a more and more influential position among the dailies of the city.

For good or for evil, the newspaper press of the United States has attained an importance and an influence unparalleled in any other country. Nowhere else does the number of newspapers bear so large a proportion to the population,[1] nowhere else are the newspapers so universally read. If it must be added that nowhere else is the standard of veracity, of public morality, and of decency — as exhibited in the general tone of the newspaper press — so debased, we may at least qualify the charge in a way which twenty years ago would have been impossible, by saying that a marked improvement is to be observed in every one of these respects.[2] The purification of

[1] As early as 1841, the number of newspapers in the United States exceeded the number in all the countries of Europe with two hundred and thirty-three millions of population. *Journal of Statistical Society, of London*, vol. iv.

[2] To take a single but most conspicuous example, — for a dozen years preceding the outbreak of the Rebellion the debasing influence of the *New York Herald* upon the people of the country was to be measured not alone by its enormous circulation, but also by the example it offered to the managers of all other newspapers as the most successful enterprise in the history of journalism. Smaller editors in smaller cities emulated its cynicism, its ribaldry, its abuse of the best men, its complicity with the worst; and found their account in such a course. The *New York Herald* of to-day is a respectable and useful newspaper, conducted with all its old enterprise and ability, and doubtless more prosperous than at any previous period of its career; and it would probably be impossible now to find in the country any example of the same contempt of decency and moral principle which conferred such bad eminence upon it a generation ago.

the political atmosphere, brought about by the war of the Rebellion, has produced no more extraordinary or encouraging result than this amelioration of the newspaper press. To say that it is not yet the leader in morals or politics, is simply to say that newspapers are business enterprises, depending for their success on the favor and patronage of their readers. When the newspapers of the country shall be seen to reflect the instincts and principles and opinions of the best classes of the population, they will constitute the most powerful and efficient force in correcting that tendency to a "levelling downward," which one of the most intelligent and friendly of our foreign critics has pointed out as among the most dangerous traits of the American people.

The weekly newspapers, of which the name is legion, stand on a quite different footing from the dailies. In the important matter of news, and the expression of critical opinions on current events, political or other, they can of course not attempt to rival the daily sheets. They are, therefore, for the most part either devoted to the interests of a special class, professional, religious, or philanthropic; or else to the dissemination of society gossip, or literary contributions from correspondents, and selections from books, magazines, and such other sources as may be open to the editor. The earliest of the modern Boston weeklies belonged to the latter category. Of these the most conspicuous was the *New England Galaxy*, established in 1817 by Joseph T. Buckingham, and conducted by him until 1828 with great vigor and success. The *Galaxy* had at the outset its own specialty, indicated by its subtitle, the *Masonic Magazine*. This was, however, made small account of after the first few numbers, and the paper soon made itself felt in the little community by the variety and occasional brilliancy of its literary contributions, and still more by the sharpness of its comments on whatever might be for the moment the subject of popular attention. For several years Mr. Buckingham was not without one or more libel suits on his hands, the result of his indiscreet vivacity in personal criticism. The number of contributors he was enabled to rely on gave great variety to the pages of the *Galaxy*, especially in its earlier years.



The *Saturday Evening Gazette*, established in the same year with the *Advertiser*, was, like the *Galaxy*, a vehicle for the lighter news and gossip of the day; but it was not illuminated by the vivacity and individual energy which gave interest to the older sheet. Issued nominally on Saturday evening, it has always been distributed on Sunday morning, and has probably owed to this circumstance its long and prosperous existence, which still continues.

On the first of January, 1831, appeared the first number of what may now be regarded as, in its history, characteristics, and influence, one of the most

remarkable newspapers ever printed. The *Liberator* was, from its inception to its close, — a period of thirty-five years, — substantially the work of a single man; and there is no more impressive example, in the history of journalism, of an inflexible purpose pursued for a full generation with zeal which never flagged, with courage which never flinched, with steadiness which never wavered. The first intention of Mr. Garrison was to publish his paper in the city of Washington. From this purpose he was dissuaded by his friends, who convinced him that in such a war as he was entering on his chances of success — slender enough at the best — would be reduced to nothing if he stationed himself within the lines of the enemy. He therefore on New Year's Day sent forth his first paper from Boston, without a single subscriber, a single coadjutor, or a single dollar of capital. He was his own editor, publisher, and printer. He lived in his printing-office, — a small attic in Congress Street. It is difficult to understand how he could have got his paper under the eyes of his readers, for the customary courtesy of exchange was not extended to this new comer, and the facilities for distributing printed matter at a distance were very different fifty years ago from those of the present day. But the paper was read, and produced an immediate and striking effect all over the country. At the South laws were passed making it a penal offence for any free negro to take the *Liberator* from the post-office, offering rewards for the apprehension of any person detected in circulating it; and in the State of Georgia a reward of five thousand dollars, "to be paid by the Governor to any person or persons arresting and bringing to trial under the laws of the State, and prosecuting to conviction, the editor and publisher of the *Liberator*, or any other person who shall utter, publish, or circulate said paper in Georgia." At the North, even in Boston, it was seriously proposed to enact a special law under which the paper could be suppressed and its editor punished. In the midst of these dangers the *Liberator* held its course, and was only discontinued when the abolition of slavery in the United States had become an accomplished fact.[1]

The earliest of the class newspapers were those devoted to the interests of the various religious denominations. The idea of a distinctively religious newspaper first took definite form in the mind of Nathaniel Willis, son of the printer of the *Boston Chronicle*, and himself a printer, who had served his apprenticeship at the end of the last century in the printing-office of his father.[2] By him, as early as 1816, the *Boston Recorder* was established, with the aid of Sidney Edwards Morse, who became its first editor. The *Recorder* was the representative of the Orthodox Congregationalists, and

[1] [See Dr. Clarke's chapter in this volume. — Ed.]

[2] "The subject of a religious newspaper still rested heavily on my mind. I talked with Christians in Boston often about it. Many, though they liked the plan, objected to it as impracticable, especially in the hard times occasioned by the war. Dr. Griffin said he never heard of such a thing as religion in a newspaper; it would do in a mgaazine. I said I had some experience in publishing a newspaper, and believed it could be done if Christians would encourage it." — *Autobiography of a Journalist*, by Nathaniel Willis, 1858.

was sustained by that body with much steadfastness until its union with the *Congregationalist* in 1849.

The establishment of one denominational organ naturally led to others. The Baptists were next in the field with the *Watchman and Reflector*, which followed the *Recorder* after an interval of three years, and which has perhaps reached a larger circulation than any of its rivals. It was followed in 1821 by the *Christian Register*, established by David Reed as the exponent of the principles of Unitarianism, and as a vehicle for the continued discussion of the points in theology raised some years before by the Unitarian controversy, so called. The intellectual superiority of the new sect enabled Mr. Reed to avail himself of the advice and assistance of many men of distinguished ability.[1]

Zion's Herald, the Methodist organ, was established in 1824; the *Universalist*, in 1829; and the *Christian Witness*, the representative of the Episcopal Church, in 1835,—completing the list of denominational weeklies, so far as the Protestants were concerned. The Catholics, not to be singular, in 1838 established a Catholic organ, the *Pilot*. All these sectarian newspapers have been maintained in apparent prosperity up to the present time.[2]

A class of newspapers of great importance to the material prosperity of the country is that of the agricultural papers. The earliest of these was published at Boston in 1816, the *Massachusetts Agricultural Repository and Journal*. The next were the *American Farmer*, established in Baltimore in 1818, and the *Ploughboy*, in Albany in 1821. The fourth was established in Boston in 1822, under the title of the *New England Farmer*, by Thomas Green Fessenden, who conducted it with ability and discretion until his death in 1837. Transferred in 1846 to Albany, and continued there under a change of name, it was some years later revived in Boston, where it has continued without interruption to the present day. The evident usefulness of a well managed newspaper for farmers, — a class of home-keeping men, always much given to adhering to old and established methods, — caused this class of papers to multiply with great rapidity. Farmers' journals sprang up all over the country; and, in addition to these, almost all the weekly papers found it for their interest to make up for every issue a farmers' column. It is difficult to estimate the influence of all this information in improving the methods of agriculture in a country like our own; in introducing machines for farm work; in improving the breed of cattle and horses; in explaining systems of drainage, and the treatment of poor

[1] In a sketch of the history of the *Register*, read by Mr. W. H. Reed, at a dinner commemorative of its fiftieth anniversary, Mr. Reed says of his father: "His chief advisers in the earlier years of the *Christian Register*, were Dr. Channing, Dr. Ware, Professor Norton, and other gentlemen of equal ability outside the ministerial profession. Among those who contributed to its columns were President Kirkland, Dr. Noah Worcester, Judge Story, Dr. Greenwood, Dr. Bancroft, President Sparks, and Mr. Edward Everett."

[2] [See more or less mention of them in the chapters in this volume on the various denominations. The *Pilot* was the earliest *permanent* Catholic organ. — Ed.]

land; in broadening the minds and enlarging the resources of one of the most important classes of the population.

The example set by the religious and the agricultural newspapers has been followed by innumerable journals established in the interest of other professions and classes. Law, medicine, commerce, natural and mechanical science, mining, architecture, music, are represented each by its special journal, which faithfully reports whatever of interest in its own line transpires all over the world. Temperance, spiritualism, the rights of woman, — whatever new movement of reform or progress, whether real or imaginary, is set on foot, is at once furnished with its organ in the form of a newspaper, through which its friends may assert and defend its claims; until it seems as if, in spite of the enormous and ever increasing accumulation of books, the remark of Mr. Hale upon taking charge of the *Advertiser* in 1814, concerning the dependence of the vast majority of the people on their newspaper, and the small amount of any other reading accomplished, must be nearly as true to-day as it was two generations ago.

Having finished this rapid survey of the growth of the newspaper press for a hundred years, let us go back to the beginning and look at the condition and progress of general literature during the same period.

It is obvious that every condition of political and social existence a hundred years ago was unfavorable to intellectual production. The absorbing interests and labors of the war were followed by the depression of property, and later by the excitement of a new government and the strife of parties, which engrossed the attention of nearly all of that class capable of literary work. Of this class, as of the whole population in fact, the intellectual stamp was severely practical and even prosaic, with little imagination or vivacity. Admirably developed on the side of political aptitude, of public and private virtue, of good sense and sound judgment, of personal independence, they were deficient on the side of the genial virtues, of taste, friendship, the capacity for recreation. With a Puritan ancestry so close behind them, they could not well have been otherwise. And yet the distinctive features of that ancestry — the Puritan quaintness, hardness, rigidity, theologic style — had, in fifty years of political excitement and struggle, well-nigh disappeared. Where there is a man of conspicuous intellectual force, he does not waste himself in his closet nor in the pulpit; he is busy with affairs of state. Astonishing as has been the development of mind, the enlargement and emancipation of thought, the journalism and the literary work of these years is distinctly inferior to that of the colonial period. That the literary ability is not wanting is shown by the state-papers of the day, which are models of clear, vigorous, and often elegant writing. That the literary instinct is not wanting is shown in the early establishment (in the one instance at the darkest hour of the Revolutionary War) of such institutions as the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, and the Massachusetts Historical Society. The American Academy was founded in 1780, with

Governor Bowdoin as its first president; and was of great service in promoting a love of scientific observation, and in preserving and making known such observations and discoveries as were made.[1]

The Massachusetts Historical Society was founded in 1790, — ten years after the American Academy, — chiefly through the enthusiasm of Jeremy Belknap, for the purpose of "collecting, preserving, and communicating the antiquities of America."[2] Its collections were at first published in the form of a weekly periodical called the *American Apollo*, and published by Belknap & Young. This method was continued for nine months. The collections were then issued monthly, and collected into volumes as often as they accumulated to a sufficient mass. After 1799 they were published only in volumes, at intervals averaging about two years. The interest and value of these collections, and of the published proceedings of the Society now covering nearly a century of active life, are quite inestimable. They are, however, by their nature works of limited circulation, and in the early days of the Society their influence was confined to a very narrow circle of readers and students.

Of miscellaneous literature at this time there was next to none. Of the books which this serious people read at this period some idea may be gathered from the infrequent booksellers' advertisements in the newspapers.[3]

The appetite for a lighter and more attractive literature than the booksellers provided was, however, not absolutely wanting. By the year 1789 it was sufficient to produce a genuine monthly magazine, highly miscellaneous indeed as to its contents, and with no very elevated standard of style or matter, but sufficient unto its day, and ominous of better things to come. The first number of the *Massachusetts Magazine, or Monthly Museum of Knowledge and Rational Entertainment*, was issued in January, 1789.[4] It

[1] [An account of the Academy is given in Mr. Dillaway's chapter in Vol. IV. — Ed.]

[2] In a letter to Mr. Hazard, asking him to become a member, Belknap writes: "We have now formed our society, and it is dubbed not the Antiquarian but the Historical Society. It consists of only eight, and is limited to twenty-five. It is intended to be an *active* not a *passive* literary body; not to lie waiting like a bed of oysters for the tide of communication to flow in upon us, but to seek and find, to preserve and communicate literary intelligence, especially in the historical way." — *Mass. Hist. Soc. Proc.*, i. xv.

[3] Here is one from the *Independent Chronicle* of Feb. 17, 1780: "The following books may be had of J. Boyle, in Marlborough Street, as cheap as the times will allow, — viz., Lord Chesterfield's celebrated letters; Sherlock's *Discourses*, 4 vols.; Doddridge's *Rise and Progress of Religion in the Soul;* Watts's Lyric Poems; Stickney's Singing-Books; Josephus's *Works*, 4 vols.; Kennet's *Roman Antiquities;* Bundy's *Roman History*, 6 vols. folio; Mrs. Rowe's *Devout Exercises;* English Grammar; *Complete Housewife;* Crosby's *Mariner's Guide;* Dodd on *Death; Lives of Criminals*, 3 vols.; etc." A few Latin classics, and books on physics and surgery are added. The same paper advertises: "In a neat pocket volume, the whole of the orations that have been delivered on the fifth day of March annually, to perpetuate the memory of the horrid massacre perpetrated on the 5th of March, 1770. There will be ten orations in the volume, and the price will be 20 dollars, sewed, in blue."

[4] This is, however, by no means to be supposed the first venture of this sort in Boston, though it was the first which seemed to establish itself on something like a permanent footing. Mr. Tudor appends to his account of the *An-*

was an octavo of sixty-four pages, made up of brief articles seldom extending beyond two or three pages, and as varied in character as may be inferred from the title-page, which promises "Poetry, Musick, Biography, History, Physick, Geography, Morality, Criticism, Philosophy, Mathematicks, Agriculture, Architecture, Chymistry, Novels, Tales, News, Marriages, Deaths, Meteorological Observations, etc.;" with this motto from Horace: —

> "Omne tulit punctum qui miscuit utile dulci,
> Lectorem delectando, pariterque monendo."

It does not appear that anything was omitted from this comprehensive programme. The editors congratulate themselves at the outset on being able to work in "a soil which Genius has marked for her own, and in which literary flowers continually bud and blossom;" and at the end of the first year are glad to assure themselves that in their first volume "stoical severity can find nothing incompatible with pure morality, nor adverse to the grand principles of religion; neither has the blush of sensibility crimsoned the cheek, nor the lovers of wit received gratification at the pain of innocence." They promise a sedulous attention to matter and manner, "lest a failure of this kind might discourage Hope from any further attendance, extort an indignant frown from the smiling Apollo, and wrest the prophetick scroll from the hand of Fame, — all which is most seriously deprecated."

During this same year the newspapers print an advertisement of the "First American Novel," *The Power of Sympathy, or the Triumph of Nature: A novel founded in truth, and dedicated to the young ladies of America.* The new magazine printed elegant extracts from this production which time has mercifully swallowed up, but which we can well enough imagine to have been a tearful history overcharged with sentiment and romance, and loaded down with moral essays and reflections on suicide and seduction. A stronger omen of the sensational school was issued two or three years later. In the *Massachusetts Mercury*, April 4, 1793, appears the advertisement of *The Helpless Orphan, or Innocent Victim of Revenge: A novel founded on incidents in real life. By an American lady.* This also has happily disappeared.

thology, and the club which conducted it, the following list, which he says "contains (1821) the titles of all the magazines that have been published in Massachusetts": —

American Magazine and Hist. Chronicle.	3	vols.	1740–43.
Royal American Magazine	1	,,	1774.
Boston Magazine	1	,,	1784.
Massachusetts Magazine	8	,,	1789–96.
Columbian Phœnix and Boston Review	1	,,	1800.
New England Quarterly Magazine	1	,,	1802.
Monthly Anthology	10	,,	1803–11.
Literary Miscellany	2	,,	1805–6.
Emerald, or Miscellany of Literature	2	,,	1806–8.
Ordeal	1	,,	1809.
Something by Nemo Nobody	1	,,	1809.
Omnium Gatherum	1	,,	1810.
Cabinet and Repos'y of Light Literature	1	,,	1811.
General Repository and Review	4	,,	1812–13.
Panoplist — Calvinistic Monthly	28	,,	1806–20.

[The *Boston Magazine*, begun with November, 1783, was published by Norman & White; later by Greenleaf & Freeman; and then by Edmund Freeman. Sabine says it extended to 1789. Imperfect sets are in the Public Library and in Harvard College Library. — ED.]

Of the periodicals still in existence in 1821 he gives the following list: —

New England Med. Journal (quarterly).	Established,	1812.
North American Review	,,	1815.
Athenæum (selections from foreign magazines)	,,	1816
Massachusetts Agricultural Repository and Journal	,,	1816.

The Christian Disciple, Unitarian (every two months).
The Gospel Advocate, Episcopalian (monthly).
American Baptist Magazine (monthly).
The Missionary Herald (continued Panoplist).

But Mrs. Hannah Foster's "Novel, founded on fact," entitled *The Coquette; Or the History of Eliza Wharton*, published originally in 1797, ran through half-a-dozen editions, continuing for a generation to move the sympathy of tender readers by its vapid and high-flown sentiment, and is still attainable.

Eight volumes of the *Massachusetts Magazine*, running over as many years, brought it to the end of its career. Its work was taken up, though in a somewhat different spirit and style, a few years later, by an association of literary gentlemen calling themselves the Anthology Club,[1] who in 1804 assumed the conduct of the *Monthly Anthology, or Magazine of Polite Literature*, of which the first number had been issued in the preceding November. Of this little club of active-minded young men, — a modest centre of literary radiance in the little town, — and of the periodical which it sustained with a worthy pertinacity for eight years, the memory is surely worth preserving. One of its members, William Tudor, has left us an account of it, of which so much as space will allow shall be here transcribed. Its founder was the Rev. William Emerson, who became the editor of the *Anthology* after six numbers had been issued by his predecessor, Mr. Phinehas Adams, and "who induced two or three gentlemen to join with him in the care of the work, and laid the foundation of the Anthology Club."

"The club was regularly organized, and governed by certain rules; the number of resident members varied from seven or eight to fifteen or sixteen; there were a few honorary members in other towns or states, who occasionally contributed to its pages. It was one of the rules that every member should write for the work; the contributions were in some cases voluntary, in others were assigned by vote, which was the usual practice in regard to reviews. . . . Nothing was published without the consent of the society. . . .

"The following gentlemen were members of the club, some of them for a short time only, the rest during the greater part of its existence: Rev. Drs. Gardiner, McKean, Kirkland; Rev. Messrs. Emerson, Buckminster, S. C. Thacher, and Tuckerman; Drs. Jackson, Warren, Gorham, and Bigelow; Messrs. W. S. Shaw, P. Thacher, W. Tudor, A. M. Walter, E. J. Dana, William Wells, R. H. Gardiner, B. Wells, James Savage, J. Feild, Professor Willard, Winthrop Sargent, J. Stickney, Alexander H. Everett, J. Head, Jr., George Ticknor.[2]

"The club met once a week, in the evening; and, after deciding on the manuscripts that were offered, partook of a plain supper, and enjoyed the full pleasure of literary chat. . . . The meetings were often prolonged into the middle watch, and the member who went away too soon was a subject of pity. It is observed in the records of one evening: 'Mr. ——, as usual, went away early, on which Mr. —— remarked that he was like Mercutio, always killed in the second act.' The concluding minutes of another evening are: 'The society broke up (*credite posteri*) before eleven o'clock.' . . . The pages of the *Anthology* were very unequal, but . . . the work undoubtedly

[1] [The records of the Anthology Club, 1805–11, are in the cabinet of the Historical Society. See Lee's *Lives of the Buckminsters*, 128, 323, 407. — Ed.]

[2] Many other names, since widely known, added brilliancy to the pages of the *Anthology*. W. E. Channing, then in the first year of his pastorate at Federal Street, had a paper in the first number, on "Ambition." Andrews Norton was a frequent writer; Nathaniel Bowditch, John Quincy Adams, R. H. Dana, were occasional contributors.

rendered service to our literature and aided the diffusion of good taste in the community. It was one of the first efforts of regular criticism on American books, and it suffered few productions of the day to escape its notice." [1] . . .

But the publication of their magazine, which was discontinued at the end of its tenth year, in 1811, was by no means the greatest service which the members of this little club were able to render to the community in which it flourished.[2] It was proposed among them to form an Anthology Reading-room and Library. The plan was taken up with spirit; several of the members made generous gifts of books; and the enterprise, once set on its feet, commended itself so strongly to the friends of letters outside the club, that a subscription of money was obtained which assured its immediate success. This was the origin of the Boston Athenæum, — a private institution sustained and fostered by private benefactions, but conducted from the first with an enlightened liberality which has placed it among the most important and useful educational institutions of the city.[3]

The *Anthology*, in its turn, expired; and around the pleasant board of the little club (if, indeed, the club survived its parent) other questions exercised the minds of its members than the composition of the next number of the magazine. It had, however, served a good purpose, and the literary taste of its members was now free to employ itself in other fields. An opportunity was not long in arriving. Mr. Tudor, whose reminiscences of the *Anthology* I have just quoted, confident that there was by this time enough of literary skill in the community to warrant such an undertaking, began in May, 1815, the publication of the *North American Review and Miscellaneous Journal*. "It was originally intended," says Mr. Tudor, "to combine the properties of a magazine and a review, and was issued every two months. It continued in this manner until 1818, when it was changed to a quarterly publication. . . . My motives in this publication were not wholly selfish. I thought such a work would be of public utility, and that there was talent enough in this vicinity to give it ample support. I began it without sufficient arrangement for aid from others, and was, in consequence, obliged to write more myself than was suitable for a work of this description, which requires a variety of style, and much more elaborate investigation of the subjects discussed than any one person can possibly give. I was, however, occasionally assisted by some of the ablest writers we possess." [4]

The confidence of Mr. Tudor was more than justified by the result. Under a succession of editors, — of whom Willard Phillips, Edward T.

[1] *Miscellanies*, by the author of "Letters on the Eastern States." Boston: 1821.

[2] Josiah Quincy said of this club, with most or all of whose members he was more or less intimately acquainted: "Its labors may be considered as a true revival of polite learning in this country, after that decay and neglect which resulted from the distractions of the Revolutionary War, and as forming an epoch in the intellectual history of the United States." — *History of the Boston Athenæum*.

[3] [See the Chapter on "Libraries" in Vol. IV. — Ed.]

[4] Of the first four volumes, three quarters are known to be wholly from his pen. Quincy's *Boston Athenæum*, app. p. 59.

Channing, Edward Everett, and Jared Sparks were the earliest followers of its originator, — the *North American Review* maintained its place for more than fifty years at the head of the periodical literature of the country. In the range of subjects treated, in the ability and learning brought to the discussion of them, in the soundness and justness of its criticisms on the current literature of the day, in the general temperance, right-mindedness, and consistency of its tone, it established a standard of literary performance of which it is not easy to measure the influence, but which we shall not be likely to value too highly. Among its writers may be found the name of almost every man who has ennobled the literature or the statesmanship of Massachusetts. John Adams, Daniel Webster, Edward Everett, and A. H. Everett were among the contributors of the first three years. Bancroft, Palfrey, Prescott, among historians; Bryant, Longfellow, Dana, Emerson, among poets; Norton, Sparks, Ticknor, Parsons, Story, Savage, among scholars; Jacob Bigelow, Bowditch, Peirce, Gray, among men of science, — such were the names which in the early history of the *North American*, before the rapid multiplication of books had begun, upheld in its pages the cause of sound letters, and answered conclusively the question as to the possibility of a national literature in America. The day of quarterlies has passed; the pace of the world of letters, as of the world of business, has grown too rapid to comport with their deliberate and long-drawn articles, and their long intervals of torpor, during which a book may almost be said to be made, read, and forgotten. The habits of these later days require reviews to be prompt, frequent, compact, open to all comers, making less account of dignity than of point, and less of consistency than of a nimble wit. We shall be fortunate if the light-armed successors of the *North American* are able to hold their ground with so much tenacity, and to give, after half a century of work, so good an account of themselves.

The three periodicals I have noticed are interesting as showing the steady rise of the taste and capacity for letters in Boston in the early years of the century, and the gradual formation of a literary class, — small indeed in numbers, and limited in scope and strength, and wholly imitative of English models; but exhibiting, year by year, a firmer confidence, a steadier grasp of subject, a more independent spirit in criticism, and a hopeful impatience of their own limitations. A very small proportion of this class were able to command sufficient leisure for extended literary work; the hospitable pages of the magazine or review offered them an opportunity for literary recreation of which they were not slow in availing themselves.[1]

The number of books by native authors, published at this period, is

[1] Judge Story, writing in 1819 to Sir William Scott, describes with emphasis this condition of American life: —

"So great is the call for talents of all sorts in the active pursuit of professional and other business in America, that few of our ablest men have leisure to devote exclusively to literature or the fine arts, or to composition or abstract science. This obvious reason . . . will explain why we have few professional authors, and these not among our ablest men." And in the same letter, speaking of having forwarded to his correspond-

very small. The publishers, of whom at the opening of the century there were already a half-dozen in the city, showed a commendable enterprise in the reprinting of the English classics. The monthly lists of the *Anthology* include the names of Shakespeare,[1] Pope, Goldsmith, Scott, Southey, Burke, Adam Smith, Boswell's Johnson, Bacon, Bunyan, Campbell, Paley, Hume, and perhaps others. But except in one department there is but a scanty sprinkling of American writers. That exception consists in the sermons which were poured forth in portentous numbers, without ceasing, — sermons and replies to sermons; orations, addresses, and sermons again. These were the mists of the dawn, through which the promise of the day was not undiscernible.[2]

Even before the beginning of the present century works of more than transient interest and value began to make their appearance at intervals, and examples of sustained literary labor are not wholly wanting. Jeremy Belknap's comprehensive *History of New Hampshire*, published between the years 1784 and 1792, — of which the first volume was issued at Philadelphia and the other two at Boston, and which, far from limiting itself to the bare recital of historical incidents, treated broadly of the physical geography and the natural history of the State and of the social condition of its people, — was a work of real and substantial value, and was separated from all previous American histories — as of Hubbard, Hutchinson, Prince, Mather, and lesser writers[3] — by a mental revolution not less marked and decisive than the political revolution of which it was largely the result. The Puritan tone has disappeared, and if the modern philosophic note has not been struck, its hour is visibly at hand. In 1794, Dr. Belknap began in his *American Biography* the publication of a collection of short biographical memoirs "of those persons who have been distinguished in America as adventurers, statesmen, philosophers, divines, warriors, authors, and other remarkable characters, comprehending a recital of the events connected with their lives and actions." Beginning with the earliest explorers and continuing with the English settlers of Virginia and New England, the work was interrupted by the author's too early death before the appearance of the second volume.

ent some numbers of a "review published in Boston," presumably the *North American*, he says: "The review is edited by gentlemen young in life, engaged in active business, and who have scarcely a moment of leisure to devote to these pursuits. The labor, too, is voluntary, and without profit to themselves." — Story's *Life and Letters*, i. 320.

[1] [See a note to Mr. Clapp's chapter on "The Drama," in Vol. IV. — Ed.]

[2] As early as 1786, an enthusiastic writer in the *Centinel* had discovered that the sun was even then risen. "This," he exclaims, "is certainly the age of American literature. The original performances which have lately appeared in the United States are such as must excite very pleasant emotions in every philanthropick breast. The memoirs of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences do great honour to the gentlemen who compose it, and to the taste of our country. 'The Conquest of Canaan,' by Mr. Dwight; 'McFingal,' supposed by Mr. Trumbull; the tragedy of 'The Patriot Chief;' the poems of Arouet; and a collection of twenty-four poems just published in the Southern States, — are instances which prove the prophetick inspiration of the Bishop of Cloane to be other than Utopian, who, sixty years since, speaking of America, said: —

> "'There shall be sung another golden age,
> The rise of Empire and of Arts,
> The good and great inspiring epick rage
> The wisest heads and noblest hearts.'"

[3] [See Vol. II. — Ed.]

Miss Hannah Adams is perhaps the earliest instance in our history of a woman who deliberately devoted herself to a life of literary study and production. Her *View of Religions* was published as early as 1784, and met with great success. Her *Summary History of New England* appeared in 1799, after prolonged research rendered difficult and painful by an impaired eyesight, which did not, however, prevent her from undertaking a still more laborious project, the *History of the Jews*. Her *History of New England* was afterward published in an abridged form for the use of schools, — an enterprise which finally involved the good lady in a controversy of prodigious length and growing exasperation with the Rev. Jedediah Morse, who after publishing his *American Geography* and his *Gazetteer* composed in his turn a *Compendious History of New England*, also for the use of schools, which Miss Adams maintained to be an infringement upon her own abridgement. The quarrel enlisted a great number of disputants, and extended with more or less vivacity over a period of ten years. Nathaniel Bowditch issued, in 1800, his *Practical Navigator*, and was perhaps even then consciously preparing himself for the great work which was to make his name as famous in Europe as in America.[1] Dr. Abiel Holmes had published, in 1798, his *Biography of President Stiles*. In 1805 he published his *American Annals*, a work which, admirable as it is in comprehensiveness, accuracy, clearness, and compactness of statement, is singular in the strictness of its abstinence from so much as a comment on the events recorded. These are annals only, but very full and complete annals of all that was known eighty years ago concerning the history of the American continent from its discovery by Columbus to the time at which the book was written.[2]

Mrs. Mercy Warren's *History of the Rise, Progress, and Termination of the American Revolution* was published in the same year with Dr. Holmes's work, to which it forms a striking contrast. Mrs. Warren's book, published in her seventy-seventh year, though written some years earlier, is a record of recent events of the most exciting character, in which the writer had the most personal interest, and with many of the actors in which she had an intimate personal acquaintance. The pages glow with a woman's enthusiasm, admiration, indignation, and triumph, and are enlivened by the animation, vigor, and wit which had made their author one of the most interesting and most influential of the women of the Revolutionary era.[3]

In 1803 Thaddeus Mason Harris,[4] — a man who possessed the true literary spirit, who was one of the earliest members of the Massachusetts Historical Society, and who had held from 1791 to 1793 the office of librarian of

[1] [See Professor Lovering's chapter in Vol. IV. — Ed.]

[2] Jared Sparks, in a review of the second edition, published in 1826, says of this work: "It is the best repository of historical, biographical, and chronological knowledge respecting America that can be found embodied in any one work."

[3] [See Mrs. Cheney's chapter in Vol. IV. John Adams took exception to Mrs. Warren's account of him in this book, sometimes with justice, but too often with an ill-concealed and offensive temper; and his correspondence with her is printed in 5 *Mass. Hist. Coll.* iv. — Ed.]

[4] [See portrait and note in the chapter on "Dorchester," in this volume. — Ed.]

Harvard College, — published a compilation of general information called *The Minor Encyclopædia*, in four small volumes; which served a useful purpose as a substitute for the more voluminous *Cyclopædia* of Rees, then the standard work of its class, and which remained in general use a generation later. In 1805 Mr. Harris published a volume on a topic, then untouched: *A Journal of a Tour into the Territory Northwest of the Alleghany Mountains: Including a geographical and historical account of the State of Ohio.*

The letters of John Adams, which had been printed in the *Boston Patriot*, were collected and published in a volume in 1809; and in the same year the works of Fisher Ames,[1] who had died the year before, were published with a brief memoir. This volume was the subject of a cordial review in the *Anthology*, by Josiah Quincy.

The biographical dictionaries of Dr. John Eliot and William Allen were published, as it happened, almost simultaneously in 1809. The former work was limited in its scope to "a brief account of the first settlers and other eminent characters among the magistrates, ministers, literary and worthy men in New England." Mr. Allen's dictionary was more general, bringing his biographies down to the time at which he wrote, and including a concise history of the thirteen colonies. During the next year Dr. Trumbull's *General History of the United States* appeared, — the last of the histories written in the rigid Puritan temper, with the faith in special providences to a chosen people still unshaken.

The *Lectures on Rhetoric and Oratory* of John Quincy Adams, delivered to the students of Harvard College during his brief professorship, and which became widely celebrated as examples of the art of which they treated, were published in two large volumes in 1810. In the same year appeared Isaiah Thomas's not less celebrated *History of Printing*. Thomas, long a prosperous printer in Worcester, established himself in 1788 in Boston with Ebenezer T. Andrews, where the business increased so rapidly that in a few years they had established branch houses in Baltimore, Albany, and perhaps one or two other cities. They were the publishers of the *Massachusetts Magazine*. In the publication of school-books they acquired something like a monopoly, and most of those used throughout the United States for a generation bore the familiar imprint of Thomas & Andrews. Of the *History of Printing*, the constant references to it in the chapters of this work[2] which treat of the Press and Literature of the earlier periods are sufficient evidence of the value and interest. Thomas was an enlightened and liberal-minded man, and his love and appreciation of good literature are abundantly exhibited in all that we know of his honorable and successful career. He was one of the most active of the founders of the American Antiquarian Society in 1812; was president of the society till his death in 1831, and



[1] [See note to Mr. Lodge's chapter in this volume. — Ed.]

[2] [See Vol. II. p. 410, for Thomas's portrait. — Ed.]

endowed it by his will, bequeathing to it his valuable library and a building for its use.

If we look through these early years for works of imagination, whether of poetry or prose fiction, we shall find little to cheer us. Fiction is long represented by Mrs. Susannah Rowson, prominent during the first twenty years of this century as a successful teacher of young ladies in Boston and Medford, as she had been prominent at an earlier age as a sprightly and graceful actress. She was the editor of the *Boston Weekly Magazine*, a periodical in quarto form, published by Samuel Gilbert and Thomas Dean, and which had an existence of three years. For this magazine Mrs. Rowson wrote a serial story, running through thirty-three numbers, called "Sincerity," and published in 1813 in book form, by Charles Williams, under the new title of *Sarah, the Exemplary Wife*. *Charlotte Temple* and *Reuben and Rachel* were novels of which perhaps the most that can be said is that they were the best produced as yet on these shores; yet of the former Buckingham says twenty-five thousand copies were sold in a few years.

As to poetry, — Joseph Story,[1] then twenty-five years old, printed in 1804[2] a poem in heroic metre, entitled the *Power of Solitude*, with some fugitive verses added; but I have seen it stated that at a maturer age he burned all the copies he could get possession of. The only other poetical publication I know of, belonging to these early years, is a thin volume which appeared in 1808, called *The Embargo, or Sketches of the Times*, — a ferocious attack on the administration of Jefferson and the statesmen connected with it. This was the singular beginning of the poetical life of William Cullen Bryant. He was but fourteen years old when this little poem was published; and the second edition of it, issued the next year, contained a note from his father, drawn from him by some doubts which had been expressed as to the age of the author, and certifying that the poem was written before his son had completed his fourteenth year.

As regards the production of literary works, the century since the close of the Revolutionary War divides itself naturally enough into four periods, not very unequal in point of time, — the first extending to the establishment of the *North American Review;* the second ending with the first publication of the *Dial*, in 1840; the third with the breaking out of the Rebellion. Of the first period we have already made a review which, however hasty and superficial, is sufficient to show that, along with a lamentable but not unnatural poverty of literary resources, there existed the material for rapid and substantial improvement in the future. We shall see, as we go on, how steady was the growth of the literary spirit as the complement of the national growth in wealth and material consequence.

Taking, then, the establishment of the *North American Review* as the beginning of our second period, it is evident that at that time there

[1] [See his portrait and references in Mr. Morse's chapter in Vol. IV. — Ed.]

[2] The same year in which he published his first legal work, *Pleadings in Civil Actions.*

existed no general literary culture outside the small circles of educated and well-to-do persons like that from which this *Review* and its forerunner, the *Anthology*, had sprung. It was to these circles that the publishers commended the slender editions of the foreign and domestic authors which they ventured to send forth. Dwellers in the country, and to a large extent dwellers in the city as well, were content to depend on the semi-weekly newspaper, with its poor little budget of news, its borrowed fragment of tale or essay, and its bit of watery poetry in the corner of the last page. A copy of the *Pilgrim's Progress*, or the *Saints' Rest*, might not improbably find its place with the family Bible on the table of the best room, and a well used copy of the spelling-book or *Farmer's Almanack* lay more ready to hand in the family living-room or kitchen. Of the limited extent to which the diffusion of wholesome literature had proceeded, we have an illustration in the works which were from time to time compiled, to serve as reading-books in the schools. Of these books, the most successful and widely used at the time we are considering were perhaps the two published by Caleb Bingham, — the *American Preceptor*, of which the first edition was published in 1794, and the *Columbian Orator*, which followed two years later. Successive editions of both these works were issued, and for a full generation they continued in general use in the district schools of New England. Of the two, the *Columbian Orator* was perhaps the more popular, and held its place the longer. It contained, in the words of the title-page, "a variety of original and selected pieces, together with rules calculated to improve youth and others in the ornamental and useful art of eloquence." It was a forbidding and gloomy compilation. Of eighty pieces here brought together, four were on the Day of Judgment; thirteen were fragments of speeches in Parliament, on topics which had for the most part long lost their interest for American readers. Speeches in Congress, speeches to the Roman Senate and people, civic and academic orations on the greatness of the United States, on the power of eloquence, on the glory of independence, furnished another large proportion of the whole. There were thirteen poetical extracts from such sources as the *David and Goliath* or the *Moses in the Bulrushes* of the excellent Hannah More, from Addison's *Cato*, from Rowe's *Tamerlane*. To all this dismal entertainment the only relief was a scene from a farce of Garrick, and a bit of Miss Burney's *Camilla*, turned into a dialogue. Nothing illustrates more forcibly the forlorn condition of mind in which our forefathers walked through this vale of tears than such a collection of their children's school-pieces.[1] From the *Columbian Orator* of Caleb Bingham to the *American First-Class Book* of John Pierpont is but a few years in time; but what an advance in breadth and capacity of understanding! The amelioration in the mental and spiritual condition of the people

[1] A venerable lady has told me with a remembrance half amused, half painful, of having, as the eldest child of the family, and the most proficient in her studies at the district school, been called by her grandmother, on the occasion of the minister's visit at the house, to stand up and read to him from the *Columbian Orator* the fragment beginning, "Let us endeavor to realize the majesty and terror of the universal alarm on the final judgment day," etc.

is now proceeding at an accelerated rate. Many causes can be seen to have worked together in producing this change, — the rapid decline of the Puritan spirit, and the emancipation of the people from the theological straight-jacket which had cramped and stifled them so long; the improvement in their material condition; the leaven of the neighboring university; the increased ease of communication between town and country; the more abundant distribution of the reprints of English books which were now rapidly multiplying.

An Elementary Treatise on Mineralogy and Geology, by Professor Parker Cleaveland of Bowdoin College, published in 1817, was a work of great scientific value, which brought its author at once into intimate relations and correspondence with Davy, Brewster, Cuvier, and many other eminent men of science in England and on the Continent, where he was at once made a member of no less than sixteen learned societies.[1]

Dr. Jacob Bigelow's *Florula Bostoniensis* belongs properly to the first of our periods, the first edition having been published in 1814. His second work, *American Medical Botany*, — a collection of the native medical plants of the United States, with their properties and uses in medicine, diet, and the arts, — was published in 1819-20, in three volumes, and was everywhere recognized as a work of great practical as well as scientific value.

The writings of Alexander H. Everett, which began to appear about this time, are of two quite distinct kinds, corresponding with the two distinct lines of life which he followed alternately. Mr. Everett was Minister of the United States, successively at the Hague and at Madrid, at a period when the relations of the European powers among each other were in a very uncertain state. While occupying the former position he wrote an essay, which was published at London and Boston in 1821, entitled *Europe, a General Survey of the Political Situation of the Principal Powers*, etc., in which he took a somewhat optimistic view of the prospects of European politics, which appears, curiously enough, to be based chiefly on what he expected from Russia. This work was translated into French, German, and Spanish, and was followed in 1827 by a work of similar character, on the situation and prospects of America; in which the author states with force the fortunate conditions attending the growth and development of the United States, and answers, without exaggeration or excess of pride, the cavils of unfriendly foreign critics. Upon Mr. Everett's return to Boston in 1829, he became the editor of the *North American Review*, and one of its most constant writers upon purely literary topics. Two volumes of his *Critical and Miscellaneous Essays*, including some poems, were published in 1845.

In 1824 the *North American* welcomed an efficient coadjutor in the *Christian Examiner*. The *Examiner* took up the work of the *Christian*

[1] A second edition of his work was called for in 1822, and another in 1836, — a longevity remarkable in a treatise on a natural science in which so many discoveries have since been made and so many new theories promulgated. [See Professor Lovering's chapter in Vol. IV. — Ed.]

Disciple, a monthly Unitarian Magazine, begun in 1813 under the charge of Dr. Noah Worcester, and continued later in the hands of the Rev. Henry Ware, Jr. The *Examiner* was at first edited by John G. Palfrey, and was long remarkable among the denominational journals for the high literary character of its articles, in which the theological bias was not allowed to stand in the way of sound philosophic discussion of topics quite distinct from all theologic connection. It was in the first year of the *Examiner* that the literary ability of Channing was first brought to the general notice, by his articles on Milton, Napoleon, and Fénelon. The Unitarian denomination was young, fresh, vigorous, and had, through much hard fighting, made good its claim to a place among the Christian sects of the day. The enthusiasm of the contest was not yet cooled, and the foremost men among the denomination (young men almost without exception) believed its mission was to be accomplished by work.[1] Channing, in an article on "National Literature," printed in the seventh volume of the *Examiner*, explained the Unitarian idea of the connection of sound literature with a sound theology in these most explicit words: "Our chief hopes of an improved literature rest on our hopes of an improved religion. From the prevalent theology which has come down to us from the dark ages we can hope nothing. It has done its best. All that can grow up under its sad shade has been already brought forth. True faith is of another lineage." On the other hand the *Missionary Herald*, successor of the *Panoplist*, the earliest sectarian magazine established in Boston, sustained with vigor the cause of the declining ancient faith; but it sustained that cause with theologic weapons exclusively. Into the domain of pure literature its champions did not enter. The faith of Channing was justified; and from that early day to the present the literature of this country has been the work of men to whom the old New England theology was but a tradition.[2]

About 1825 an increase of productiveness is apparent, though the increase was not immediately sustained. In this year first appeared, in its complete form, the *History of New England*, by John Winthrop, of which a portion, comprising all that was then known to be in existence, had been printed in 1790, at Hartford, under the auspices of Governor Trumbull. In the spring of 1816 the missing volume of Winthrop's manuscript was accidentally discovered in the tower of the Old South Meeting-house, and placed in the keeping of the Massachusetts Historical Society, which at once took measures looking to its publication. A somewhat serious difficulty stood in the way of this enterprise. The handwriting of the first governor was as hieroglyphics to his successors. But "the labor we delight in physics pain." James Savage gladly undertook the work of deciphering the manuscript and preparing it for the press;[3] and, after many delays and

[1] "In beginning the publication of the *Christian Disciple*, five years ago, we announced our intention to use it in defence of controverted religious truth." — Preface to first number of the *Christian Examiner*, 1824.

[2] [See Mr. Bradford's chapter on "Philosophic Thought in Boston," in Vol. IV. — Ed.]

[3] "The difficulty of transcribing it for the press seemed to appall several of the most competent members. The task appeared inviting to

accidents, the entire diary was worthily published by him in 1825, with abundant notes.

Jared Sparks, who had become for a second time the editor of the *North American Review* in 1822, began, shortly after, his laborious researches among the state papers at Washington and in the capitals of all the original States of the Union, with a view of publishing a collection, as nearly complete as possible, of the writings of Washington. The papers at Mount Vernon were put into his hands; and in 1828 he obtained, by the friendly influence of members of the British Cabinet and of Lafayette, permission to transcribe such documents as he might find of use in the state-paper offices of London and Paris. The publication of this work, which extended to twelve volumes, covered the years from 1834 to 1837. Its success was immediate and gratifying.[1] This was but the beginning of an imposing series of compilations, involving prolonged and tedious if not difficult research, requiring the exercise of judgment in the selection and skill in the arrangement of voluminous material which would have appalled at the outset all but the stoutest of literary workers. In 1829 Mr. Sparks brought out the *Diplomatic Correspondence of the Revolution*, also in twelve volumes octavo, of which the material was derived mostly from the archives of the State Department at Washington, though the foreign offices furnished as before a considerable portion. From 1835 to 1840 he published a collection of the *Works of Franklin* with a memoir of his life, taken up where the autobiography stopped. In addition to these labors he wrote and published, in 1832, a *Biography of Gouverneur Morris;* he originated the *American Almanac*, of which, in 1830, he edited the first volume; he projected and carried out a *Library of American Biography*, of which one series, covering the years from 1835 to 1839 and comprising ten 12mo volumes, was so successful that another series was begun at once, which extended to fifteen volumes, of which the last was published in 1846. Of the sixty brief biographies included in these twenty-five volumes, eight were written by Mr. Sparks. Perhaps no other American writer has added so great a mass of valuable matter to the libraries of his country. His work, if not brilliant, is enduring; and all laborers in the field of American history and biography will owe to his patient and long-continued labors their own comparative exemption from the drudgery of research.[2]

In a lighter walk of literature, also, a greater activity is observable. Miss Catherine Sedgwick's stories were among the first works of fiction which can be said to possess any considerable merit. *A New England Tale*, published anonymously, appeared in 1822. It was followed, two years

me."— Savage's preface. [See Vol. I. p. xvii. 109, 463. — Ed.]

[1] A selection of the letters was published in Paris by Guizot; and at Leipsic, Von Raumer published a translation of the entire work.

[2] [The library of Mr. Sparks, rich in works on American history, is now in Cornell University, except his manuscript collections which are in Harvard College Library. A catalogue of it, prepared by C. A. Cutter, has been printed.— Ed.]

later, by *Redwood*, which achieved great popularity both at home and abroad, being reprinted in England and translated into French, German, Italian, and Swedish. Within the next eleven years Miss Sedgwick produced *Hope Leslie*, *Clarence*, *Le Bossu*, *The Linwoods*, and a series of children's books. They are for the most part placid stories of New England country life, with vivacity enough to retain a gentle hold on the attention, and with a refinement and grace of style which carry the reader not unwillingly over the long descriptive or reflective passages, during which the action of the story comes to a halt.



The first stories of Lydia Maria Child followed close upon those of Miss Sedgwick, which in their chief characteristics they much resemble. *Hobomok*, an Indian novel, appeared in 1824, and *The Rebels* the next year. But Mrs. Child's extraordinary versatility and untiring industry would not let her be content with a single line of work. She set on foot in 1826 a children's magazine called the the *Juvenile Miscellany*, of which she remained for eight years the editor, writing for it such stories as children enjoy and profit by at once, — short, lively, picturesque in character and incident, and with a moral not too obtrusive. She was at the same time the editor of a collection of biographies called the *Ladies' Family Library*, for which she wrote the lives of Madame de Stael and Madame Roland, of Lady Rachel Russell and Madame Guyon, *Biographies of Good Wives*, and the *History of the Condition of Women in All Ages* in two volumes. *The Mothers' Book*, *The Girl's Book*, and the *Frugal Housewife*, are works of which the character is indicated by their titles. A genial good sense, and practical, convincing wisdom, gave both charm and influence to these simple lessons in the essentials of home life, not less needed by the present generation than by that for which they were written. But the books thus enumerated, various as they are, were far from exhausting the lines in which Mrs. Child's activity found its exercise. She was an ardent reformer. Her compact and vigorous *Appeal for that class of Americans called Africans*, published in 1833, was one of the earliest books to help on the Antislavery movement, which was then beginning to acquire momentum; and her noble enthusiasm in this cause never flagged to the end of her long life.[1] In 1841 she became, with her husband, an editor of the *National Antislavery Standard*, published in New York, to which city they had lately removed. Twenty years later, when John Brown lay under sentence of death in Charlestown (Va.) jail, Mrs. Child sent him a letter of sympathy which involved her in a correspondence with Governor Wise and Mr. Mason, of Virginia.



[1] [See Dr. James Freeman Clarke's chapter in this volume. — Ed.]

This correspondence was published in a pamphlet, of which three hundred thousand copies were circulated,[1] — a striking illustration of the excited state of public feeling at that crisis. The "Letters from New York," contributed at short intervals to the *Boston Courier*, in 1841–42, probably did more for the immediate popularity of Mrs. Child than any of her more laborious works. Depicting with rare tenderness and observation, and with a lively and graceful style, the thousand contrasted aspects of human life in a great city, the letters were greatly admired and copied into newspapers all over the country. They were afterward collected and published in two volumes. Her last important work, the most ambitious of all her undertakings, was issued in 1855, in three volumes, with the title, *The Progress of Religious Ideas*.

Two remarkable series of books for children were commenced nearly simultaneously in 1825; the one by S. G. Goodrich, afterwards much more widely known by the *pseudonym* of Peter Parley, attached to his first books. Mr. Goodrich was a Boston publisher, and began in 1828 an illustrated annual called the *Token*, which was continued until 1842. Mr. Goodrich was the chief contributor, but was assisted with an occasional paper from other hands, among whom was Nathaniel Hawthorne, then quite unknown to fame. Many of the *Twice Told Tales* appeared in the *Token*, where they attracted little or no attention, and where, but for the splendor of his greater works, they would have doubtless remained decently interred. The books of Peter Parley are upon all imaginable subjects within the comprehension of children, from the elementary arithmetic and geography of the primary school, to travels, biography, natural history, astronomy, and political economy, and the young reader has his choice of subjects. Mr. Goodrich's own count of the number of his published works runs up to one hundred and seventy, of which one hundred and sixteen were issued under the name of Peter Parley. "Of all these, about seven millions of volumes have been sold. About three hundred thousand volumes are now sold annually."[2]

The works of Jacob Abbot are not less voluminous than those of Mr. Goodrich. The *Young Christian* series of books for boys, issued in 1825, comprises four volumes. The *Rollo Books*, begun in 1830, extended to twenty-four volumes. Later came the *Marco Paul Series* and the *Franconia Stories;* the one of six volumes, the other of ten. Then followed a long succession of illustrated histories, ancient and modern; then more story books, twelve series; and finally a course of *Science for the Young*, treating, in separate volumes, of Light, Heat, Electricity, Water, Land, etc. Very many of these books are even now in active circulation, and are as much admired by the boys and girls of to-day as they were by their grandfathers and grandmothers fifty years ago.



[1] *New American Cyclopædia.*

[2] Goodrich's *Recollections of a Lifetime*, 1856.

Of poetry, the production during the second period was very slender in quantity. There was, however, now and then something in that direction worth considering. "Going into town one day," writes Richard H. Dana, "while assisting E. T. Channing in the *North American Review*, he read to me a couple of pieces of poetry which had just been sent to the *Review*,—the 'Thanatopsis' and the 'Inscription for the Entrance to a Wood.' While Channing was reading one of them I broke out, saying, 'That was never written on this side the water;' and naturally enough, considering what American poetry had been up to that moment."

Richd H. Dana, Jr
Boston, Feby /64

It was ten years after these early poems of Bryant were published before Dana (who had contributed some slighter pieces to the *New York Review*) published, in 1827, *The Buccaneer, and other small poems*. In 1833 he issued a larger volume, which included some later poems and the papers written many years before for *The Idle Man*. In the same year Longfellow has published his first modest volume, the grave and tender translation of the *Coplas de Manrique*. Whittier, editor of a small newspaper in Hart-

My remaining years cannot be many. I can give them to my books, and shall try to wait patiently for the great Final Result, with calmness and without fear.

And now, what more have I to add, but to ask for you and yours all peace and comfort.

Your grateful friend
Charles Sprague

December, 1864.

AUTOGRAPH OF CHARLES SPRAGUE.[1]

[1] [An extract from his "Centennial Ode" is given in *fac-simile* in Vol. I., p. 246. For Mr. Waterston's notice of Charles Sprague, see *Mass. Hist. Soc. Proc.*, February, 1875, p. 427. The present fac-simile is from a letter lent by his son, Mr. C. J. Sprague. — ED.]

ford, has printed two years before his *Legends of New England*, and in 1836 will publish *Mogg Megone*. In the latter year Holmes's first volume will appear. There is even a moment when it seems possible that an ex-president may devote to the service of poetry the powers which have raised him to the heights of statesmanship. In 1832 there appears a poem, in heroic verse, entitled *Dermot McMorrogh; Or the Conquest of Ireland*, — an historical tale in four cantos, by John Quincy Adams, which owed its existence to the author's admiration for Byron's *Don Juan*, and which, as his son suggests, "would probably have met with a better reception from the public had the expectation been less high, and its model not have overshadowed it altogether."

Charles Sprague, whose occasional poems, — notably the *Shakespeare Ode*, written for the festival at the Boston Theatre, in 1823, the *Ode for the Centennial Celebration of Boston*, in 1830, and the Phi Beta Kappa poem on *Curiosity*, — had struck a note of grace unusual in productions of that character, was also the author of many minor poems in which the tenderness and purity of thought were matched by the grace and felicity of expression.

Of the poetry of John Pierpont, the greater portion perhaps consists of occasional verses for the dedication of churches, for the ordinations of ministers, for the meetings of temperance societies, for anniversary celebrations, for the laying of corner-stones, and the like, — fugitive verses, of which the interest passed away with the occasions which called them forth. Another considerable portion consists of patriotic and political pieces which blaze with the ardent spirit of the reformer, much as those of Whittier did, twenty years later. There are, however, a small number of poems of a wholly different and superior order, — poems filled with a soft and tender fancy, like the "Passing Away," or with grave and lofty reflection, like "The Exile at Rest," — which indicated a poetic gift which would doubtless have borne more abundant fruit but for the pressure of the stormy times on which it fell.



A new magazine was established in 1831. Mr. Edwin Buckingham, son of the renowned editor of the *Galaxy* and the *Courier*, — who had served an apprenticeship in the office of the last named paper, during which he had shown a marked aptitude for literary work, and who had afterward been made an assistant-editor of the *Courier*, — ventured, with his father's assistance, to set on foot the *New England Magazine*. At the death of its young projector, two years later, his father became its editor; but finding the double charge of a monthly magazine and a daily newspaper too much even for his vigorous powers, it was sold, in 1834, to Dr. S. G. Howe and John O. Sargent. In a literary point of view the enterprise was a successful one. Since the discontinuance of the *Anthology*, there had been in Boston no vehicle for the lighter forms of periodical writing; except per-

haps the *Galaxy*, which, however, was a newspaper and not a magazine, and which was now extinct. A new generation had grown up since the days of the *Anthology*; and the opportunity furnished by the new monthly for the publication of miscellaneous papers, however varied in subject or style, was not neglected. Mr. Buckingham, in his reminiscences, gives, among the more or less frequent contributors to the *New England Magazine*, the names of Edward Everett, Judge Story, Dr. Holmes, Hillard, Hildreth, Longfellow, Dr. Howe, and Miss H. F. Gould.[1] "One dollar a page," says Buckingham, "was offered for such original communications as might be accepted and published; and this, insignificant as the sum may seem to those whose talents and popularity are in demand at a much higher price, brought communications from almost every State in the Union." In 1835 the magazine was purchased by Park Benjamin, who, the next year, united it with the *American Monthly Magazine*, of New York.

During the years from 1830 to 1840, although the production of literary works of importance was not very considerable, there was an increasing activity of mind which was to bear manifest results in succeeding years. Along-side the growing intellectual cultivation of the people, great social, moral, and political questions began to agitate the public mind, which were to temper and shape the literature of the next generation. The tremendous question of Slavery, feared and hated all over the country, was now rising steadily into prominence. Of the Antislavery movement, Boston was long the centre. Such an element in the national politics was a perpetual stimulus to the best minds of the whole country, but its influence was here especially strong and pervasive. No department of literature escaped it. The total-abstinence movement, the reform of diet, the subject of imprisonment for debt, were topics of less exigency, but which had their share of attention and discussion.[2] The subject of public-school education had been hitherto more a matter of local pride and self-gratulation than of intelligent study. It was now to be discussed in a way which left little to be said but much to be done. In 1837 Horace Mann became Secretary of the Massachusetts Board of Education; and in the eleven years during which he held that position he put forth, in place of the formal and complacent reports which the incumbents of similar offices are wont to lay before a satisfied public, a series of formidable documents, which it is safe to say will long remain unexampled in the records of official literature. No conviction was ever

[1] This must have been one of the earliest periodicals to offer compensation to its writers. Mr. Congdon, in his *Reminiscences*, says of literary remuneration: "Fifty years ago, apart from the money paid to preachers and perhaps the writers of school-books, there was no such thing. I should be surprised to find that Bryant received any money whatever for 'Thanatopsis,' which was published in the *North American Review* for 1817. Out of Boston in 1820 I question if any Massachusetts editor received so much as $500 a year, for most writing in newspapers was done by lawyers and other men of education, as a matter of love or political fealty. The first magazines paid nobody; and much later there were respectable periodicals which never ran the risk of hurting a young writer's pride by offering him sordid wages. Mr. Willis was the first magazine writer who was tolerably well paid; at one time, about 1832, he was writing four articles monthly for four magazines, and receiving $100 for each" (p. 126).

[2] [See Mr. George P. Bradford's chapter, in Vol. IV. — Ed.]

more firmly rooted in the minds of the people of Massachusetts than that of the excellence of their public school system and the efficiency of its administration. But no system of public administration, however excellent, was ever without abuses. Mann spent fifteen hours a day in travelling up and down over the State, — making himself acquainted with the schools, the studies pursued in them, the competency of the teachers, and the progress of the scholars; collecting information of the condition and efficiency of about three thousand different public schools and several hundred private schools and academies;[1] and whenever an abuse, whether little or large, fell under his eye, it was proclaimed without reserve and without mercy. But this severity was in the interest of the public whom he served, and was but the logical and necessary outcome of enthusiasm in his work, which alone could have carried him at once through the prodigious labors and the embittered personal controversies in which it involved him. His reports are treatises on almost every subject which bears even remotely on the main topic. In the very first of those reports he thus states the divisions into which the general topic had arranged itself in his mind: 1. The number and condition of school-houses; 2. The manner in which school committeemen discharge their duties; 3. The interest felt by the community in the education of all its children; 4. The competency of teachers. In considering the first of these divisions, he discovered at once that it would carry him far beyond reasonable limits, and he therefore laid it aside and submitted later, as a supplementary report, a careful essay on the planning of school-houses, illustrated with numerous plans. His observations of the incompetency of the teachers in most of the schools, — an incompetency arising in most cases, not so much from inability as from lack of training, — led him to recommend the immediate establishment of normal schools to provide the training needed; a recommendation which was at once carried into effect. His reports were commonly accompanied with letters from scientific or medical experts, sustaining or elaborating some important point upon which he perhaps anticipated objections. Letters from Dr. S. G. Howe, Dr. James Jackson, Dr. S. B. Wood, and others appear in these documents, which are in themselves valuable contributions to the public knowledge in the matters of detail of which they treat. I must not be tempted into even a brief review of the services of this admirable public character; that belongs to another chapter: but any account of the literary achievements of Boston would be ludicrously incomplete which should fail to take account of the intellectual vigor, the mastery of subject, and the terseness and polish of style which distinguish these remarkable reports.[2]

The literature of Germany was now beginning to exert a manifest influence on studious minds in New England. Among the scholars of a generation before, a knowledge of Latin and Greek was far more common than a knowledge of French and German. And long after French became a matter of course, the great German writers remained practically unknown

[1] First *Report*, 1838.

[2] [See Mr. Dillaway's chapter in Vol. IV. — Ed.]

on these shores. As early as 1824, indeed, George Bancroft, newly returned from the schools and the scholars of Germany, had published in the *North American Review* translations of the minor poems of Schiller and Goethe. But we find no further indication of interest in this direction until 1831, when a professorship of German language and literature was created at Harvard College. The place was fortunately filled by the appointment of Charles Follen, who, upon assuming the duties of his office, delivered an inaugural address, setting forth the high and varied character of the literature of Germany, as well as its strong claims on the attention of readers in America. During the next year Professor Follen delivered a course of public lectures in Boston on Schiller. In 1833 Andrews Norton and Charles Folsom established the *Select Journal of Foreign Periodical Literature*, in which papers appeared on Goethe, Fichte, Jean Paul, and Heine. Papers began to appear also, from time to time, in the *Christian Examiner*, by F. H. Hedge, George Ripley, Theodore Parker, and others, on Schiller, Swedenborg, Herder, Strauss, Schelling, and Kant.

Such articles of Carlyle and Coleridge as found their way to this country greatly helped on the growing appreciation of German writers, until it seemed for a time as if the long-cherished English models, upon which the early literature of the country had been exclusively fashioned, were to be superseded by this new and strong Teutonic influence. "What work nobler," said many enthusiastic students in the words of Carlyle, "than transplanting foreign thought into the barren domestic soil?"

It was under such conditions that there grew up in Boston a little coterie of literary persons, not all producers of literature, in whom a lively dissatisfaction with the too practical and unimaginative life of the little New England city, not yet quite emancipated from the joyless traditions of its founders, was mingled with a somewhat indefinite notion of the processes by which the better life might be achieved. They have left plentiful testimony concerning their attitude towards the prevailing conditions, and their desires and hopes of amelioration.

"Transcendentalism," says W. H. Channing, "was an assertion of the inalienable integrity of man, of the immanence of divinity in instinct. On the somewhat stunted stock of Unitarianism, whose characteristic dogma was trust in individual reason as correlative to supreme wisdom, had been grafted German idealism as taught by masters of most different schools, — by Kant and Jacobi, Fichte and Novalis, Schelling and Hegel, Schleiermacher and DeWette; by Madame de Stael, Cousin, Coleridge, and Carlyle; and the result was a vague, yet exalting conception of the godlike nature of the human spirit."[1]

"They see," said Margaret Fuller, "that political freedom does not necessarily produce liberality of mind; nor freedom in church institutions, vital religion. And seeing that these changes cannot be wrought from without inward, they are trying to quicken the soul, that they may work from

[1] *Memoir of Margaret Fuller*, vol. ii. p. 12.

within outward. Disgusted with the vulgarity of a commercial aristocracy, they become radicals; disgusted with the materialistic working of rational religion, they become mystics. They quarrel with all that is, because it is not spiritual enough."

The first public utterances of the new faith were in three remarkable addresses by Ralph Waldo Emerson. Two of these — read, the one before the Phi Beta Kappa Society at Cambridge, in July, 1837; the other a year later, before the literary societies of Dartmouth College — are substantially identical in subject; both treating of the opportunities, the resources, privileges, and duties of the American scholar; summoning, as with the blast of a trumpet, the thinking man of the New World to come out from the empty ways of classic and European tradition, and take his rightful place at the head of the tumultuous army of workers. The scholar must live not alone in the world of books, but in the world of men. "Inaction is cowardice, and there can be no scholar without the heroic mind." He must study and guide the life of to-day, not overvaluing the methods of the past. "Our day of dependence, our long apprenticeship to the learning of other lands, draws to a close. Neither Greece nor Rome, nor the three unities of Aristotle, nor the three kings of Cologne, nor the College of the Sorbonne, nor the *Edinburgh Review*, is to command any longer." He must trust his own intuitions, his own insight. "Let him not quit his belief that a pop-gun is a pop-gun, though the ancient and honorable of the earth affirm it to be the crack of doom!" He must be free and brave. "Fear is a thing which the scholar, by his very function, puts behind him. Fear always springs from ignorance." He must respect himself and his calling, despising alike the praise and the blame of men. "How mean to go blazing, a gaudy butterfly, in fashionable or political saloons, the fool of society, the fool of notoriety, a topic for newspapers, a piece of the street, and forfeiting the real prerogative of the russet coat, the privacy and the true and warm heart of the citizen!" "Fatal to the man of letters, fatal to man, is the lust of display, the seeming that unmakes our being."

This was high teaching, unexampled in quality and force in the literature of college festivals. The third address applied the same principles to the test, not of the scholar, but of the preacher. This was the memorable address to the graduating class of the Divinity School at Cambridge, in the midsummer of 1838, of which the accents still linger in the ears that listened to it. The principles insisted on in the two discourses above spoken of, as necessary to the true scholar, are here insisted on with even loftier eloquence as vital to the true preacher, — sincerity, truth, courage, and a serene faith in the divine order of creation which provides that all the forces of Nature work with him who honestly endeavors. "Whilst a man seeks good ends, he is strong by the whole strength of Nature." "Character is always known; thefts never enrich; alms never impoverish; murder will speak out of stone walls. The least admixture of a lie — for example, the taint of vanity, any attempt to make a good impression, a favorable appear-

ance — will instantly vitiate the effect. But speak the truth, and all Nature and all spirits help you with unexpected furtherance. Speak the truth, and all things, alive or brute, are vouchers; and the very roots of the grass underground there do seem to stir and move to bear you witness."

These noble discourses, in which the elevation of thought is matched by the vigor and picturesqueness of style, determined the position of Mr. Emerson, not only as the leader of the Transcendentalists, but as the head of the literary class in this country. How steadily he has maintained that position through all the mental growth and development of forty years need not here be told. The first series of his collected essays was published in 1841; the second series in 1844. A volume of poems appeared in 1847. More than any other writer who has permanently enriched our literature, Mr. Emerson's relations with the public have been those of personal teaching. By far the greater portion of his writings have been first read from the lyceum platform; but the lecture — which more than any other form of literary work, if we except the sermon, tempts to diffuseness, to inaccuracy, to commonplace — has never carried him beyond the temperance and concentration of his earlier academic addresses.

Among the earnest men and women who welcomed the "new views," perhaps there was no one who did more to stimulate their growth and, however indirectly, to promote their diffusion than Margaret Fuller. She wrote little for the printer, but the testimony to her inspiring influence in teaching, in correspondence, and in conversation above all, is abundant and unanimous. Her studies of German literature had begun in 1832, or thereabout, under the influence of Carlyle's papers in *Frazer's Magazine*, and elsewhere. In 1839 she published a translation of Eckermann's *Conversations with Goethe;* and, two years later, a portion of the letters of Gunderode and Bettine.[1] When, in 1840, the Transcendentalists had got so far as to desire an organ through which they could give a readier and wider publicity to their views than they were likely to attain through any of the established and more conservative periodicals, Miss Fuller was looked to on all sides to become the editor of the new journal. Mr. Emerson's account of the origin and career of the *Dial* is at once so concise and so comprehensive that I cannot do better than cite it here: —

"This work, which when it began concentrated a good deal of hope and affection, had its origin in a club of speculative students, who found the air in America getting a little close and stagnant; and the agitation had perhaps the fault of being too secondary or bookish in its origin, or caught, not from primary instincts, but from English and still more from German books. The journal was commenced with much hope and liberal promises of many co-operators; but the workmen of sufficient culture for a political and philosophical magazine were too few; and as the pages were filled by unpaid

[1] [See chapters by Mr. Bradford and Mrs. Cheney in Vol. IV. — Ed.]

contributors, each of whom had, according to the usage and necessity of this country, some paying employment, the journal did not get his best work, but his second-best. . . . For these reasons it never had a large circulation, and was discontinued after four years. But the *Dial* betrayed, through all its juvenility, timidity, and conventional rubbish, some sparks of the true love and hope, and of the piety and spiritual law which had moved its friends and founders; and it was received by its early subscribers with almost a religious welcome. Many years after it was brought to a close, Margaret was surprised in England by very warm testimony to its merits; and in 1848 the writer of these pages found it holding the same affectionate place in many a private book-shelf in England and Scotland which it had secured at home. Good or bad, it cost a good deal of precious labor from those who served it, and from Margaret most of all." [1]

The contents of the first number of the *Dial* for January, 1841, are hardly less interesting to-day than they were forty years ago. The address "from the Editors to the Reader," with which it opened, was by Mr. Emerson, and was a strong and stirring statement of the motives which urged the founders of the new journal. "They have obeyed with great joy the strong current of thought and feeling which for a few years past has led many sincere persons in New England to make new demands upon literature, and to reprobate that rigor of our conventions of literature and education which is turning us to stone, which renounces hope, which looks only backward, which asks only such a future as the past, which suspects improvement, and holds nothing in so much horror as new views and the dreams of youth." Margaret Fuller contributed "A short essay on Critics" and an account of a recent exhibition of Allston's pictures; Theodore Parker, a paper on "The Divine Presence in Nature and the Soul;" George Ripley, a review of Brownson's writings; W. H. Channing, a psychological study called "Ernest the Seeker;" Bronson Alcott, a heterogeneous collection of "Orphic Sayings;" J. S. Dwight, a paper on "The Religion of Beauty" and a brief review of "The Concerts of the past Winter;" and Mr. William D. Wilson, a notice of Channing's translation of Jouffroy. The poetry of the number included "The Problem," by Mr. Emerson, and lesser poems by Thoreau, C. P. Cranch, and Charles Emerson. Few magazines, we imagine, have set out for their readers a more inviting table.

Of the *Dial* writers, the greater part were little given to frequent publishing. Mr. Emerson, writing slowly, has in the course of a generation happily accumulated a considerable body of enduring literature. Mr. Alcott, after his *Conversations with Children*, published in 1836, and the little volume on *Spiritual Culture*, printed little or nothing until the *Atlantic* offered him, twenty years later, the opportunity of publishing such fragmentary and miscellaneous reflections as he was fond of putting forth. Margaret Fuller's fame rests not so much on her books, *Summer on the Lakes*, *Woman in the Nineteenth Century*, or her letters to the *Tribune*, as on the traditions of her extraordinary conversation, her insatiable appetite

[1] *Memoir of Margaret Fuller*, i. 323.

for knowledge and study, and her personal influence over all who were brought into her society. Thoreau, indeed, did not disdain, in spite of his small opinion of his fellow-men, to set down his impressions of Nature for their edification; and his books are characteristic of his most eccentric and non-conforming disposition. His *Record of a Week on the Concord and Merrimack Rivers* and *Walden, or Life in the Woods*, both published eight or ten years after the experiences which they describe, were all that he himself sent to the press; but from his manuscripts his friends were able to prepare and publish after his death several volumes, to the first of which, *Excursions in Field and Forest*, Mr. Emerson prefixed a tender and enthusiastic memoir of his friend. *The Maine Woods* and *Cape Cod* are interesting additions to a list of writings which only partially reveal a soul of singular and fascinating individuality.

Transcendentalism had its day and passed. Ardently believed in and upheld by the little band of the faithful, a target for much good-natured raillery from the unregenerate, in no great time it ceased to be proclaimed. Perhaps its atmosphere was a little thin and chill for the sustenance of a hard-working New England community; but the ideas and sentiments of the Transcendentalists were neither abandoned nor lost sight of, and their mark was long visible in the literature, the theology, the politics, and the art of New England.[1]

Literary production was now visibly increasing, and the distribution of books was accomplished to an extent not before known through the medium of circulating libraries. Another important medium of communication between the writer and the public now comes into prominence. The lecture system, instantly successful in the cities, was swiftly extended through the country, until no considerable town could afford to be without its annual course of lectures extending more or less through the winter months, and enlisting the aid of writers more or less famous according to the resources of the place. The Lowell Institute of Boston, inaugurated on the first of December, 1839, by an address from Edward Everett, has maintained to this day from six to ten courses of lectures every year, in which many of the most eminent men of this country and England, in literature, science, and theology, have read careful essays on almost every conceivable topic related to those departments.[2] "It has been ascertained," said Mr. Everett in the opening address above alluded to, "that twenty-six courses were delivered in Boston during the last season, not including those which consisted of less than eight lectures. . . . These lectures were attended in the aggregate by about thirteen thousand five hundred persons, at an expense of less than twelve thousand dollars. This is probably a greater

[1] [The reader may compare a parallel view of the rise and decline of Transcendentalism in Mr. George P. Bradford's continuation of Dr. Ripley's chapter on "Philosophic Thought in Boston," in Vol. IV., treated in its relation to living and believing, and so a good counterpart to the present sketch. — Ed.]

[2] [See an account of the Institute in Mr. Dillaway's chapter on "Education," etc., in Boston, in Vol. IV. — Ed.]

number of lectures than was ever delivered in any previous year, but the number of courses has been steadily increasing from the time of their first commencement on the present footing, about twenty years ago." [1]

The lecture system, in its best estate an admirable educational instrument, has been subject to dreadful abuse. The unbounded appetite of the New England communities for this form of intellectual nourishment has tempted vast hordes of charlatans and pretenders to try their fortunes in this profitable field. "The hungry sheep look up and are not fed." The pay of the lecturer has grown more exorbitant in proportion to the dilution of his mixture, until professional jokers have usurped the places once graced by philosophers and poets; and to-day the lyceums are served by a new species of broker, who ekes out the failing literary material with the better entertainment of music and play-acting.

But the lecture has been, and perhaps will yet be again, of immense value in the education of the people, — less perhaps by the actual communication of knowledge, which is too easily taken in to be long remembered, than by cultivating a general taste for it, and by pointing out the avenues to it. The extent of the influence exerted year after year by the popular lectures of Agassiz, in diffusing among the people not only a knowledge and comprehension of the elementary facts of those branches of natural science which he had made his own, but a taste and inclination for serious study in them, cannot be estimated. The extent of the influence of Mr. Emerson on the tone of public opinion and sentiment in New England is to be best conceived when we remember that his delightful and ennobling lectures were read, winter after winter, to audiences composed by no means chiefly of scholars and highly cultivated persons, but of earnest people in the common walks of life, who loved to sweeten their unromantic lives with such entertainment. For ten years the lectures of Theodore Parker varied in number from forty to eighty during the season.[2]

[1] These figures were taken from Horace Mann's third report as secretary of the Massachusetts Board of Education, which further adds, "that in the State of Massachusetts, outside of Suffolk County, there were found in operation one hundred and thirty-seven lyceums, etc., maintaining annual courses, at which the average attendance for the year had been thirty-two thousand six hundred and ninety-eight." Mr. Mann adds this remark: "It has often been repeated by numerous and accurate observers that in the city of Boston the general topics of conversation, and the mode of treating them, have been greatly improved since what may be called the reign of popular lectures." — *Report of Secretary of Board of Education*, 1839, p. 74.

[2] Mr. Parker has left us the most emphatic judgment as to the value of the lecture system to the mental development of the people. In a letter dated "Northern New York, railroad cars, March 12, 1857," during the last of his great western lecture tours, he writes thus: "This business of lecturing is an original contrivance for educating the people. The world has nothing like it. In it are combined the best things of the church (*i. e.*, the preaching) and of the college (*i. e.*, the informing thought) with some of the fun of the theatre. Besides, it gives the 'rural districts' a chance to see the men they read about; to see the lions, — for the lecture is also a show to the eyes. Now I think this one of the most admirable means of educating the people. For ten years past, six or eight of the most progressive and powerful minds in America have been lecturing fifty to a hundred times in the year. Surely some must dance after so much piping, and that of so moving a sort!" Feb. 11, 1858, Mr. Parker writes to S. J. May: "This has been a stupid winter to me. I have less than half my old joyous power of work. I have lectured seventy-three times, always close at hand, and have done for

A curious instance of the mental activity which was generated in the days of the Transcendental movement is furnished by the erratic career of Orestes A. Brownson, who, having been reared among the influences of a rigid Presbyterianism, had freed himself from them when he came to man's estate, and had gone, as so often happens, to the other extreme of general negation. From this dismal condition he shortly emerged as a Unitarian, taking, some years later, the charge of an independent religious society in Boston. He had the restless energy, the personal independence, and dislike of personal accountability which belong to the free-lance in literature; and he added to this a mind unusually well equipped for polemical discussion and philosophic inquiry. He had been a frequent writer in the *Christian Examiner*, but he chafed under the mildest editorial control; and in 1838 established, with characteristic confidence, a review of his own, the *Boston Quarterly Review*, which he maintained almost single-handed for five years.[1] In 1842 Mr. Brownson united his *Quarterly* with the *Democratic Review* of New York, of which he became an editor; but the connection proved to be neither congenial nor profitable, and in less than two years he returned to Boston and established a new personal organ under the title of *Brownson's Quarterly Review*. The philosophic radicalism of the old organ had now yielded to a reactionary influence which had carried Mr. Brownson at a bound all the way from rationalism to Romanism, and the old allies were now targets for the sharpest arrows of the new and zealous convert. The *Quarterly* was maintained with unabated vigor, and still with scarcely any assistance from other writers, until 1864, and was so far from exhausting the productive ability of its extraordinary conductor that he found time to write and publish a succession of books on various subjects of a philosophic character, of which some were in the form of novels, and others in the more usual guise of a learned treatise, but all displaying in full measure the vivacity and mental resource which had marked his earlier writings. In 1873 he recommenced the *Review*, but his death, two years later, put a final stop to it.

The study of German literature, once effectively introduced among us, became rapidly, as a matter of course, a part of every educational scheme which pretended to comprehensiveness. For some years, however, the reading in this language was mostly confined to the poets. In 1848 Frederick H. Hedge published in an octavo volume a collection of extracts from the *Prose Writers of Germany*, including, besides Goethe and Schiller, many writers now familiar enough in this country, but of whom at that time little more was known than the names. Kant, Lessing, Wieland, Jean Paul,

the season. Last year I lectured eighty times, all the way from the Mississippi to the Penobscot."

[1] Of this work Mr. Ripley said in the *Dial*: "This journal stands alone in the history of periodical works. It was undertaken by a single individual, without the co-operation of friends, with no external patronage, supported by no sectarian interests, and called for by no motives but the inward promptings of the author's own soul. . . . The best indication of the culture of philosophy in this country, and the application of its speculative results to the theory of religion, the criticism of literary productions, and the institutions of society, we presume no one will dispute, is to be found in this journal."

Hegel, Fichte, Schlegel, Tieck, Novalis, Hoffman, and others were represented by selections more or less ample, accompanied with brief biographical notices; and the work was not only an interesting and valuable addition to the libraries of readers, but had a sensible influence in widening the range and confirming the taste for German studies.



Geo. Ticknor.[1]

The next year after the publication of Dr. Hedge's German selections appeared the *History of Spanish Literature*, by Mr. George Ticknor, — a scholarly and conscientious work, and a monument of persistent and long continued labor, but dealing with a literature for the most part not only

[1] [This statuette of Mr. Ticknor, made by Mr. Martin Milmore "as a compliment and expression of gratitude" (*Life, Letters, and Journals of Geo. Ticknor*, ii. 492), is inscribed: "Aet. Suæ, lxxvii. Libris semper amicis," — Mr. Ticknor selecting the motto. It was made in 1868. It is shown on a table in his library, in the engraving on the next page. A life-size bust of Mr. Ticknor, likewise by Milmore, was presented to the Boston Public Library in 1868. — Ed.]

MR. TICKNOR'S LIBRARY.[1]

unknown, but singularly undeserving of attention amid the multitude of more important claims.

There is something pathetic in the confidence with which, at intervals of a few years, some earnest soul, or perhaps a group of them, sets on foot a new periodical; starting forth with a full stock of enthusiasm and a comfortable pile of contributed material of just the required stamp, only to repeat, after a declining volume or two, the dismal story, — of enthusiasm

[1] [This cut follows a photograph taken since Mr. Ticknor's death, kindly lent by Mrs. Ticknor. The house in its present condition is shown in an engraving of Park Street, given in Mr. Bugbee's chapter in this volume; and also, as it stood a few years after its erection, in the heliotype given in Mr. Stanwood's chapter in Vol. IV. Of the above view Mr. Ticknor's daughter has furnished, by request, the following description: —

"The portrait over the fireplace is that of Sir Walter Scott, painted by Leslie for my father, mentioned in the *Life, Letters, etc. of G. Ticknor*, vol. i. pp. 388, 389, and 407; and also in Leslie's *Reminiscences*. The books visible in the cases, on the left of the spectator, are, successively, of German, French, and English literature, until the press next the fireplace is reached, which contains works on history. Between the fireplace and window are works of biography and theology. The cupboards below are all filled with books.

"The large chair by the fireplace, on the right of the spectator, is that in which Mr. Ticknor habitually sat.

"The appearance of the room, as seen in this view, is absolutely the same as when he was living, except for the addition of one or two small pieces of furniture. The Spanish books, removed after Mr. Ticknor's death, occupied the whole end of the room opposite the fireplace; and their places have been filled by Greek, Latin, Italian, and other books, which had at different times been crowded out and exiled to another part of the house." — Anna Eliot Ticknor, June, 1881. — Ed.]

quenched by hard work and lack of support, and of contributions laboriously extorted from indifferent or reluctant friends, and perhaps not of just the required stamp any longer. The *Dial* kept itself alive for four years. While it was yet comparatively prosperous, in 1842 a new magazine was established, called the *Boston Miscellany of Literature and Fashion*. Its editor was Nathan Hale, Jr., who drew contributions from Dr. Channing, Alexander H. Everett, Edward Everett, Nathaniel Hawthorne, W. W. Story, J. R. Lowell, N. P. Willis, and many others. A charming periodical was the result, which did not survive its first year.

After the discontinuance of the *Dial*, some of its most eminent supporters and contributors, chief among whom was George Ripley, the head of the Brook Farm Community, devised a new journal, — half magazine, half newspaper, — to take up, in some sort, its work as an organ of advanced thought. The new journal was called the *Harbinger*, a large octavo of sixteen pages, "published by the Brook Farm Phalanx" once a week at Boston and New York, and with an admirable list of writers, nearly equally divided between the two cities, including the names of Ripley, W. H. Channing, G. W. Curtis, Lowell, Whittier, Story, Horace Greeley, J. S. Dwight, and many more. Mr. Francis G. Shaw's translation of *Consuelo* was printed in the *Harbinger*, beginning in the first number of the paper. Attractions enough were here combined to have secured for the paper a long, prosperous, and useful existence. It was not too philosophic or too aggressive to commend itself to steady-going people who still held by the old ways, while its tone was thoroughly liberal, earnest, and progressive; but it was discontinued at the end of the fifth year.[1]

The last attempt at establishing a journal in the interest at once of good letters and of reform was the work chiefly of Theodore Parker, who in 1846 had taken charge of the society in Boston, and found his influence necessarily much enlarged by the change. Mr. Parker had never been a contributor to the *North American Review*, and that journal, under the management of Francis Bowen, was then in its most conservative phase. To the *Christian Examiner* he had been a frequent and welcome contributor; but the *Examiner* was a theological review, published in the interest of a sect, and that sect one of the least numerous of all. It was felt by Mr. Parker, as well as by many other scholars of liberal instincts, that the condition of the country was such as ought to receive more attention and sterner comment than any existing review would admit to its pages. "We want a tremendous journal," said Parker, "with ability in its arms and piety in its heart. It should be literary, philosophical, poetical, theological; above all human, — human even to divinity. I think we may find help in unexpected quarters." Many conferences were held with Emerson, Dr. Howe, J. E. Cabot, and other friends; and the first number of the *Massachusetts Quarterly Review* appeared in December, 1847. Mr. Emerson wrote the editor's address, as he had done seven years before for the *Dial*; but in the tone

[1] [See Mr. Bradford's chapter in Vol. IV. — Ed.]

of the two addresses there is a difference as wide as in the motives of the two journals. The new review was certainly not "secondary or bookish in its origin;" and its inspiration was very clearly "caught from primary instincts." The ambition here was not for culture or self-development, — the transcendental phraseology was laid aside; the desire was to move the conscience and heart of the nation, and awaken them to a more earnest interest in the national affairs. The overwhelming and stifling materialism of the people, the brutal and reckless behavior of their chosen rulers, are the points most strongly emphasized in the address of the new editors. The war with Mexico was now at its height. "We see that reckless and destructive fury which characterizes the lower classes of American society, and which is pampered by hundreds of profligate presses. The young intriguers who drive in bar-rooms and town-meetings the trade of politics, sagacious only to seize the victorious side, have put the country into the position of an overgrown bully; and Massachusetts finds no heart nor head to give weight and efficacy to her contrary judgment." A voice must be raised on behalf of decent government. But politics is not the only important matter. "A journal that would meet the real wants of this time must have a courage and power sufficient to solve the problems which the great, groping society around us, stupid with perplexity, is dumbly exploring. Let it not show its astuteness by dodging each difficult question, and arguing diffusely every point on which men are long ago unanimous." Socialism, slavery, the new questions in natural science, the new heresies in theology, invited candid and fearless discussion. It is praise enough for the new *Review* to say that it did not discredit this programme. An article of great severity on the Mexican War, by Mr. Parker; a paper by Dr. Howe, on the condition and prospects of Greece; another, by Mr. Weiss, on the life and writings of Agassiz, who had just accepted the Harvard professorship; and a thoughtful paper by Mr. Cabot, on the influence of modern civilization on the fine arts, suggested by Mr. Powers's statue of the Greek Slave; with some pages of short reviews and notices, — made up the opening number. Mr. Parker was from the first, though much against his wish, the laboring editor, receiving occasional assistance from Wendell Phillips, Henry James, Edouard Desor, and others, besides those just named as contributing to the first number. But the usual disappointments of the editor were not long in arriving. Too large a proportion of the writing fell upon him for lack of adequate help. Twelve quarterly numbers were issued, and the undertaking was then reluctantly abandoned.

Samuel G. Howe.
April 6. 1839

In the department of history, Boston has contributed to the literature of the country some works of distinguished excellence. In 1840 the two

authors who were the first, in later days, to make this department a conspicuous one, were already in full career. George Bancroft, in his long and crowded life, has shown us a remarkable example of a type not uncommon in Europe, — the union of the man of letters with the statesman. He seems from early youth to have foreseen and prepared himself for a high career.



Graduating at the age of seventeen he went abroad at once, studying for two years at Göttingen, and passing several years in alternate study and travel in Germany, Italy, and France; enjoying in all those countries, to an unusual extent, the acquaintance and friendship of men of the first eminence in scholarship, — of Schleiermacher, Wilhelm von Humboldt, and Varnhagen von Ense, in Germany; Bunsen, Niebuhr, and Manzoni, in Rome; Cousin, Benjamin Constant, and Alexander von Humboldt, in Paris. In Heidelberg he pursued his historical studies with Schlosser. Upon his return to America he became a frequent contributor to the *North American Review*, then under the charge of Jared Sparks. In 1823 he published a translation of Heeren's *Politics of Ancient Greece*. He was not long in getting at work on the history which he had early determined to undertake; but he worked with patience and deliberation, and it was not until 1834 that his first volume was ready for publication. The second and third volumes followed in 1838 and 1840, while he held the responsible, if not yet exacting, position of Collector of the port of Boston, — a position which, in the present days, we should regard as ludicrously incongruous with the quiet prosecution of literary or historical studies. *Aux vaillants cœurs, rien impossible.* Mr. Bancroft's labors on his great work were often interrupted by business of too great moment to be put by. Successive appointments to high public office, while they left him diminished leisure, saved him, perhaps, from the characteristic defect of the writer who mixes little with men. He was Secretary of the Navy in 1845; and the next year was Minister of the United States at London, holding this post until 1849. This interval was, however, of inestimable advantage to him. The public offices, both of London and Paris, opened their doors to the American Minister; and, in addition to the exhaustless records thus made available, immense collections of letters and manuscripts, which had come down from the English statesmen of the Revolutionary era and had remained in the possession of their families, were put at his disposal. The fourth volume of the history appeared in 1852; the fifth and sixth in 1854; bringing the work down to the opening of the Revolution. The period of the war, and the organization of the government under the Federal Constitution, occupied four volumes more, of which the last was issued in 1875. Finished under the pressure of advancing age, the later volumes show no decline in vivacity of style or strength and firmness of thought.

Four years after Mr. Bancroft published the first volume of his history,

there appeared the first of a series of historical works whose picturesqueness and novelty of subject won for them a popularity which no American work had as yet achieved. The career of William H. Prescott offers, in all



but perseverance and steadfast adherence to a deliberately formed purpose, a strong and pathetic contrast to the busy and conspicuous life of Mr. Bancroft. Graduating in 1814, he spent two years in travel abroad, but without any special aim beyond diversion and the restoration of his impaired eyesight. He was strongly interested in French and Italian literature, and made conscientious studies in this field, even cherishing at one time, we are told, an ambition to write a comprehensive history of the literature of one or the other of those countries; but the undertaking, on a nearer view, appeared too great, and was relinquished. The only direct result of his studies in this direction appeared in some papers contributed chiefly to the *North American Review*, and which were collected in a volume of *Miscellanies*, published in Boston and London in 1845. He had, however, conceived the desire to become a historian, and in the absence of strong predilections appears to have cast about for a subject. An entry in his diary in 1819, when he was twenty-three years old, shows the deliberation of his purpose. He there assigns ten years for general preparatory studies, and ten years more for the composition of the work, whatever it might prove to be. He made a fortunate choice of subject, in the *Reign of Ferdinand and Isabella* of Spain, and sent to Madrid for the necessary materials, which, through the influence of Mr. A. H. Everett, then United States Minister at that Court, he readily obtained. An imposing mass of manuscripts and printed works was forwarded to Boston, but found the eager student incapable of reading so much as a titlepage. The story of the trials by which Mr. Prescott was beset through his partial blindness, and of the patience, determination, and ingenuity through which he overcame them, is too familiar to need repetition. The history, spite of all obstacles, was published within the ten years which the writer had assigned for the work, and its reception was doubtless ample compensation for the fatigues it had cost him. It was at once republished in London, and translated into French, German, Spanish, and Italian. Twelve editions have been printed in the United States, and four in England. Far from resting content with this triumph, Mr. Prescott set to work without delay upon the history of the *Conquest of Mexico*. In this case, as before, he spared himself the labor of personal research through the state-paper offices, but availed himself of the assistance of willing friends, through whom he received in due time a mass of documents from the Royal Academy of Madrid, from the family archives of the descendants of Cortes, and from Mexican sources, covering some eight thousand folio pages.[1] His infirmity of eyesight did not mend, and he was forced to employ the same methods of reading and writing as in his first work. Long practice had, however, given facility both to author

[1] Griswold's *Prose Writers of America*.

and secretary. The work was finished in less than five years from its commencement, and was received not less favorably than its predecessor. It was published in 1843. The third history, the *Conquest of Peru*, appeared in 1847, after a still shorter interval. Mr. Prescott then entered on a work of much greater difficulty. The period of Philip II. was a subject involving not merely a continuous narrative of successive and obviously connected events, but the story of vast and obscure complications with almost every Court in Europe. This was the last great undertaking of Mr. Prescott, and was destined to remain a fragment. Two volumes were issued in 1855, and

PRESCOTT'S LIBRARY.

a third in 1858; and much had been done on succeeding portions of the work, when the author's patient labors were brought to a sudden close by his death, in 1859.[1]

The line of historical writers was worthily continued by Richard Hildreth, who had been one of the contributors to the *New England Magazine* in 1832, and who was for some years after that date the successful manager of the *Boston Atlas*. In 1840, having retired from that position, he devoted himself to literature. His productions were, for the most part, in the nature

[1] [The tributes published in the *Mass. Hist. Soc. Proc.* of that year testify to the honor in which he was held. A few years later, in 1864, appeared a *Life of Prescott*, prepared by his life-long friend, George Ticknor. Before beginning on his Spanish subjects, Prescott had contemplated a work on Molière, and the books he collected, becoming the property of Mr. Ticknor, were given by him to the Public Library. Mr. Prescott left by his will the manuscripts collected for the writing of his *Ferdinand and Isabella* to Harvard College Library. After some years the bulk of his library was sold at public auction; but not till the marks of his ownership had been generally and unfortunately removed. — Ed.]

of moral or political treatises. Of these, the first to attract general notice was *Despotism in America*, a vigorous though temperate and argumentative arraignment of the system of slavery in the Southern States. In 1844 he published a purely philosophical treatise called the *Theory of Morals*, followed some years later by another on the *Theory of Politics*. These works were colored by a more advanced radicalism than had before been ventured on, except, perhaps, in the columns of the *Liberator;* and their reception by the organs of criticism was surprisingly warm. This was particularly the case with the *Theory of Morals*, as to which the *North American Review* for once joined hands with *Brownson's Quarterly* in what must now be admitted to have been not so much criticism as abuse. Mr. Hildreth now began a comprehensive *History of the United States*. The work of Mr. Bancroft had reached its third volume, but was for the time interrupted by the author's official position in London. Mr. Hildreth was not satisfied with Mr. Bancroft's treatment of some portions of his subject, and tried his hand at a different plan. Less diffuse in detailed description, less enthusiastic and demonstrative in his patriotism, Mr. Hildreth passed briefly over many points on which his predecessor had delighted to linger, while he gave much attention to certain others which the earlier history had scarcely touched at all. The work was pursued with steadfast industry. Three volumes, published in 1849, carried the history as far as the adoption of the Federal Constitution; and the remaining three, bringing it down to the close of Monroe's first term, were completed and issued within three years from the appearance of the first volume.

In 1851 Mr. Francis Parkman gave to the public the first fruits of his studies in a field which, lying straight in the path of every historian of the United States, had hitherto been strangely neglected by them all. The exploits of the Spanish adventurers and the English settlers had received abundant attention at various hands; but the story of the determined and long-continued resistance of the Indian tribes, and of the French attempts at colonization, North and South, — with the experiences, heroic, pathetic, fanatic, picturesque, of the religious *entrepreneurs*, — had been left for the fortunate hand of a new writer. Mr. Parkman was not an unknown writer. The admirable papers he had contributed to the *Knickerbocker Magazine*, descriptive of his sojourn among the Indian tribes on the plains of the Platte River, and published later under the title of *The Oregon Trail*, had sufficiently introduced him as a vigorous and graceful narrator, possessing a keen relish for the wholesome and unconventional life of the camp and a generous sympathy with all forms of simple manliness, without much respect to race or color. The *History of the Conspiracy of Pontiac* was published in a single octavo volume, and at once attracted much attention, at first from the unaccustomed subject, and then from the visible merit and value of the work. Mr. Parkman next occupied himself with the attempts of the earliest French explorers; but, working under the disadvantage of a physical infirmity curiously similar to Mr. Prescott's, a long interval necessarily

elapsed before the first of the series of books was issued which are now so well known under the comprehensive title of *France and England in the New World;* and which embrace under separate titles[1] accounts of the explorations and strifes of the Spaniards and Huguenots in Florida, of Champlain on the Northern border, of La Salle on the Mississippi, the missions of Lejeune, Brébœuf, Lallemant, and Jogues on the Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence, and other phases of French-Canadian history. To the sombre and depressing details of New England Puritan history these romantic and picturesque narratives of gallant struggle, of heroic sacrifice, of steadfast endurance, — the more pathetic because for the most part futile, — afford a remarkable contrast and relief.

If the literature of Boston is rich in historical works, it is not less rich in those collections of biographical memoranda, and of the speeches, correspondence, and diaries of public men which furnish the materials for historical studies. Such collections have, in several instances, been the grateful work of proud and loving descendants; but scarcely one of the great men who have given to Massachusetts her just prominence in the history of the country has lacked a friend to whom such a task was a pleasure, adding to the long list of pious memorials, of widely-varying interest and literary importance, but animated by the same generous motive, — to preserve and hand down the remembrance of the men who in the stress of angry and turbulent politics have kept the faith, that their successors may not be without the benefit of their example. Thus, in 1809, the works of Fisher Ames were brought together and published, with a brief memoir, within a year of his death; but not so completely but that his son, Seth Ames, was able, forty-five years after, to make a much more perfect collection, including a considerable part of the correspondence of that eminent statesman. Thus William Tudor published, in 1823, his *Life of James Otis;* and J. T. Austin, five years later, his *Life of Elbridge Gerry.* Thus Josiah Quincy, in 1825, published the Life of his father, Josiah Quincy, Jr., of Revolutionary fame; and William W. Story, in 1851, the Life and Letters of his father, Judge Story; and Edmund Quincy, in 1867, the Life of his father, Josiah Quincy; and Robert C. Winthrop, in 1864, the Life and Letters of John Winthrop. The Life of John Adams, begun by his son, John Quincy Adams, was finished by his grandson, Charles Francis Adams, and printed in the first of ten octavo volumes containing the works and correspondence of the second President, and issued at intervals from 1851 to 1856. A memoir of the Life of John Quincy Adams was written by Josiah Quincy and published in 1858; but a more detailed account, composed in great measure of his diary from 1795 until his death in 1848, was compiled by Charles Francis Adams, and published in ten volumes from 1874 to 1877. The Life of James Sullivan by Thomas C. Amory; the Life of Samuel Adams by William V. Wells; of Joseph Warren by Richard Froth-

[1] *Pioneers of France in the New World; Jesuits in North America; Discovery of the Great West* (later called *La Salle*, when largely rewritten because of Margry's documentary publications); *Old Régime in the New World;* and *Frontenac.*

ingham; of Timothy Pickering by Octavius Pickering and Charles W. Upham; of Count Rumford by Dr. George E. Ellis,— are later additions.

The orators on the other hand have, for the most part, not waited for posterity, but have themselves collected and revised their speeches for publication. A volume of the public addresses of Daniel Webster was issued as early as 1830, containing the noble commemorative addresses at Plymouth and Bunker Hill, and that delivered in Faneuil Hall in 1826 on the occasion of the death of Adams and Jefferson, the great speech in the Senate on Foote's resolution, with other Congressional speeches, and the famous argument in the trial of Knapp at Salem. A brief memoir of Webster, written by Edward Everett, was prefixed to the volume. Other volumes of Mr. Webster's speeches were issued from time to time during his life, and a complete edition was in course of publication at the time of his death in 1852.

Of Mr. Everett's orations, a collection in a single volume was published in 1836, and reprinted, with additions filling a second volume, in 1850. A third volume was added by Mr. Everett in 1859, and a fourth by his sons in 1868, the last containing, among others, the remarkable address on the character of Washington,— remarkable in itself, but even more so in its extraordinary popularity, the number of its repetitions, and the sums it was made to yield to a national enterprise which was miserably defeated after all.

Collections of the speeches of Charles Sumner, of Robert C. Winthrop, of Wendell Phillips, and other prominent orators, have also been published.

When Mr. Prescott's history of Phillip II. was interrupted by his too early death, his subject was, to a certain extent, covered by a younger writer, who, like Prescott himself, had achieved a high place among the historians by his first work. Mr. John Lothrop Motley's history of *The Rise of the Dutch Republic* made its appearance only a year after the first two volumes of Mr. Prescott's *Philip*. No portion of the portentous reign of that monarch was more important in its relations to the civilization and welfare of Europe than that which was occupied by his desperate struggle with the people of Holland, and his treacherous dealings with the English queens. Of all this the story was as fully and satisfactorily told from Mr. Motley's point of view as it could have been from Mr. Prescott's. Mr. Motley had been as fortunate in the advantages he had enjoyed in composing his history as Mr. Prescott had been unfortunate. His long residence abroad gave him ample opportunity to use to the fullest the abundant materials which existed at the various courts of Germany, as well as in Spain, England, and Holland,—some of the most interesting of which had been but recently brought to light. His use of this material was not only conscientious but extremely skilful, and gave to his work a vivacity and human interest of which, until then, the only exam-

ple was to be found in the pages of Macaulay. The history, when it appeared in 1856, was a delightful surprise. Its welcome was not less warm in England and Holland than in the United States. A Dutch translation



Edward Everett[1]

was at once prepared, with an introduction by Backhuysen van den Brink. A French translation followed shortly, with an introduction by Guizot. The work was also translated into German and Russian. The author went on

[1] [This cut follows a portrait by G. Stuart Newton, painted in 1818 in London, and now owned by his nephew, the Rev. Edward E. Hale, D.D. A view of the monument on his grave in Mount Auburn is given in the *Harvard Register*, July, 1881. — Ed.]

with his studies, and published in 1861 two volumes of the *History of the United Netherlands*, the remaining two volumes of which appeared in 1867, bringing the history down to the recognition of the independence of the Republic in 1609. The mournful story of the *Life and Death of John of Barneveldc*, published in 1874, brought the writer to the threshold of the Thirty Years' War. The history of this dismal period, in which the civilization of Europe seemed about to be obscured, was the difficult labor which Mr. Motley next proposed to himself. On retiring from the office of Minister to England in 1870, he took up his residence at The Hague, in the private villa of the Queen of Holland, and employed himself once more in the congenial task of collecting and arranging his materials. He was not, however, destined to publish any portion of the work, which was interrupted by his death in 1877.[1]

The poetical promise discernible in the literature of the second period was abundantly realized in the third. Mr. Longfellow had published his *Voices of the Night* in 1839. For the next thirty years his poems were issued with frequency. He has been through life the most industrious and productive of all American poets, and both his industry and productiveness have increased since he has passed the period of middle life, when effort, unless quickened by the spur of necessity, is apt to slacken. Mr. Longfellow's later productions are far more ambitious and labored than his earlier, and they are also more sombre, — the gentle, pensive sadness of his earlier verse has deepened its tone. The melancholy of the *Christus* and of the *New England Tragedies* is quite distinct from anything to be found in his poems prior to 1860. But the minor poems of the later years have gained greatly in strength of thought and force of expression, while retaining all the sweetness and tenderness of sentiment which characterize the earlier poems.

Mr. Emerson's earliest poems enriched the pages of the *Dial*, but are preserved in a small volume published in 1847. From time to time, notably since the establishment of the *Atlantic Monthly*, specimens of this rare and thoughtful poetry were given to the public, which received them with a curious mixture of reverence and amusement, often, it must be confessed, taking their admirable qualities on trust, but charmed unaffectedly, now and then, by the commanding beauty and depth of thought. But most of Mr. Emerson's warmest admirers would doubtless agree with the judgment of Theodore Parker, that "his best poetry is in his prose, and his poorest, thinnest, and least musical prose is in his poems."[2]

Mr. James Russell Lowell printed his first volume, *A Year's Life*, in 1841. His second, *A Legend of Brittany*, with which were printed some smaller pieces, — "Rhœcus" among them, — appeared in 1844. *The Vision of Sir*

[1] [The Massachusetts Historical Society appointed Dr. Oliver Wendell Holmes to prepare the customary memoir for their *Proceedings*. The subject grew on the friendly biographer's hands, and resulted in a separate volume, whose text was subsequently abridged for the Society's record. See *Proceedings*, December, 1878. — Ed.]

[2] *Massachusetts Quarterly Review*, March, 1850.



THE FIRST DRAFT OF LONGFELLOW'S "EXCELSIOR."[1]

Launfal, in which the best qualities of Mr. Lowell's genius are visible, was published in 1848, and was followed within the year by the *Fable for Critics*

[1] [The original of this manuscript, of which the cut gives but a portion, is written on the back of a letter from Charles Sumner to Longfellow, and was bequeathed, with his other autographs, by Mr. Sumner to Harvard College Library. — Ed.]

and *The Biglow Papers*. The transcendental movement, in which Mr. Lowell had been somewhat interested, had produced many eccentricities in its disciples which invited raillery, — and these traits were hit off in the *Fable for Critics* with a nimble wit and skilful touch, in which no suspicion of ill-nature mingled. In the *Biglow Papers* a new vein was opened. The speech of the Yankee on his native heath might be picturesque, but had



never been called poetic. Mr. Lowell, in these papers, married it to immortal verse, and used it with great effect in satire, in denunciation, in warning, in pathetic appeal, to move the heart of the people to indignation and shame against the Mexican War and the schemes of the slave-power. A second series of "Biglow Papers," mostly contributed to the *Atlantic Monthly* during the Rebellion, satirized with righteous severity the politics of that period, but the old vein was not to be re-opened with success. In 1869 a volume of collected poems was issued, called *Under the Willows*, which included most of the verses which had appeared in the magazines of the past ten years; and with them the noble ode spoken at the Harvard Commemoration, in 1865, of those of her sons who had fallen in the war of the Rebellion. The style of Mr. Lowell's later poems shows, generally speaking, a distinct loss of simplicity. Some of them are marked by an involved complexity of style, amounting even to obscurity, and which suggests the influence of Browning.

Oliver Wendell Holmes[1] was in 1830, while an undergraduate at Harvard, a contributor of verses to a magazine of light literature, maintained wholly by the students, and called the *Collegian*. For this magazine he wrote some twenty-five pieces, mostly running over with extravagant fun,

but showing the turn for easy and graceful versification which has distinguished his more deliberate productions. Most of these juvenile pieces have been abandoned to oblivion by the author; but some few examples of them, as "Evening by a Tailor," "The Meeting of the Dryads," "The Spectre Pig," and others, have been admitted to a place among his acknowledged works.

[1] [There is a portrait and sketch of Dr. Holmes in the *Harvard Register*, April, 1881. — Ed.]

On the establishment of the *New England Magazine* in 1831, Mr. Holmes, then studying law, became a frequent contributor of verses, generally of much the same character as those in the *Collegian*. In 1836 these pieces, with others, including a poem read before the Phi Beta Kappa Society at Cambridge, called *Poetry, a Metrical Essay*, were published in a volume. This was the beginning of a brilliant career. Dr. Holmes's occasional poems, read before societies on anniversary days, at public dinners, and wherever men have met together for enjoyment or commemoration, have been more numerous and more admired than those of any other poet. To strike exactly the right note, to hit and emphasize just the emotion of the hour, be it grave or gay, to say the very word that every man at the table or on the benches would say if he could; and to say it with a turn of grace, a sparkle, a spirit which moved serious men to laughter, or frivolous men to tears, — this has been the felicity of Dr. Holmes. Most of his poems for the last quarter of a century have been first printed in the *Atlantic Monthly*.

In 1840 Mr. Whittier, having exercised himself in a variety of situations, — as farmer, shoemaker, editor at Boston, at Hartford, at Philadelphia; and having already been a contributor of prose and verse to newspapers and periodicals in all those cities, and published two or three small volumes of poetry, — abandoned the active walks of business, and fixed his residence at Amesbury, on the banks of the Merrimack. From this calm retreat he sent forth, mostly through the columns of the *National Era*, published at Washington, the vigorous and stirring Antislavery poems by which he became most widely known. He had been greatly moved by the brave crusade of Garrison, and was early enrolled among the active and avowed adherents of the Antislavery movement. His poems against slavery took a more fiery and aggressive tone about the time of the Mexican War, and several of the pieces inspired by that nefarious enterprise remain to this day unsurpassed in eloquence and vigor of denunciation, not unrelieved by the truest pathos. This is one side of Whittier's nature, the side earliest known by the public. There was another side, not less remarkable and more fully represented at a later period, of which the main feature is a genuine love of Nature and a keen appreciation and sympathy for every aspect in which she shows herself to the New England eye. The fields and woods, the rocks and streams of his native State, — her ice and snows as well, — are to him a constantly inspiring theme; and not less so are the homely virtues, the artless graces, the latent heroism of her sons and daughters. *Snow-Bound*, *Maud Muller*, *The Barefoot Boy*, *In School-Days*, are instances not more marked than scores of others of this warmth of loyal affection. The first collection of his poems was published in 1838, but his productiveness increased with his years, and



was greatest at about and after the close of the Rebellion. "Eight volumes of poems," says the memoir in Duyckinck's *Cyclopædia*, "were added by Mr. Whittier to his works in as many years (1864–72), one of which was a series of selections."

To account for all the poets in a community where no man with pretensions to the calling of a man of letters thinks his position assured without at least an occasional copy of verses, would here be impossible. Among the writers less known than those above noticed, are Thomas William Parsons and William W. Story. Born in the same year, the latter put forth a small volume of poems in 1847, the former in 1854 Mr. Parsons had, however, published ten years before his translation of the first ten cantos of Dante's *Inferno*, whose excellence had attracted the attention of scholars. His careful and continued study of Dante had colored visibly the style of all his minor works, the best of which are marked by reserve and purity of expression, and by gravity of thought and feeling. They exhibit, however, a certain narrowness of range and restricted sympathies; while the verses of Story are the recreations of a busy man, versatile and unequal, much more varied in style and subject than those of Parsons, with the animation and interest which come of various relations and pursuits.

In fiction, beyond the pleasant stories of Miss Sedgwick and Mrs. Child, and the Eastern tales of William Ware, little had been done which retains a place in New England literature until the publication, in 1843, of Sylvester Judd's remarkable story of *Margaret*, — a production in its main features so genuine that to the present day it holds the place which Mr. Lowell assigned to it a few years after its first appearance, as "the most emphatically American book ever written." Nobody has ever caught more exactly the spirit, at once grim and humorous, of New England country life, before its hardships were mitigated by a measure of material prosperity and by emancipation from priestly rule and the superstitions which accompanied it. Nobody has ever more lovingly observed or more accurately described the natural aspect of the New England summer and winter, and its influence on the character and temperament of the inhabitants. The book is often crude, extravagant, repelling; but its charm is neither to be denied nor resisted.

Three years after the publication of *Margaret*, a yet more remarkable story appeared. The name of Nathaniel Hawthorne had been slowly growing familiar to a limited circle of readers through the *Twice Told Tales*, of which a portion had been collected and published in 1837, and a second series in 1842; but which, keenly appreciated by a few, had left the author, as he has himself remarked, "the obscurest man of letters in America." "These stories were published in magazines and annuals, extending over a period of ten or twelve years, and comprising the whole of the writer's

young manhood, without making (so far as he has ever been aware) the slightest impression on the public."

With the appearance of *The Scarlet Letter*, in 1846, Mr. Hawthorne found himself promptly raised to as much conspicuousness as the most exacting author could desire. Criticism was silenced. Here was a book as faithful to a single phase of the New England character as Judd's had been, but informed with an imagination and creative power quite new in American literature. With a subject as sombre and revolting as any in the whole range of modern fiction, with a succession of incidents and experiences scarcely relieved by so much as a gleam of human joy or mental health, this story, like all which followed it from the same hand, but more strongly than any other, impresses the reader with a certain uneasy sense of a preternatural influence about him, yet an influence from which he is by no means anxious to escape. The author seems to have fixed on the dark ages of New England history a gaze so intense, an attention so profound and searching, as to have pierced the veil of the past, and to have seen "the very age and body of the time." This makes the commanding power of the book; its charm lies in the air of poetry and mystery with which the characters of the story are invested, and in the incomparable beauty of the style. Here, one would say, are all the essential elements of true poetry, — creative imagination, the poetic atmosphere, and exquisiteness of expression. These qualities, it is no exaggeration to say, exist in a more eminent degree in the works of Hawthorne than in any American poetry either before or since his time.

The works which followed *The Scarlet Letter*, — *The House of the Seven Gables; The Blithedale Romance; The Marble Faun; Septimius Felton*, — are all, with the exception, perhaps, of the second, more agreeable, since in them the dismal and morbid psychology, which in all is the most salient characteristic, is relieved at intervals by the sweetest and purest human sunshine.

In *The Marble Faun* Mr. Hawthorne made, for the first time, a wide departure from the field in which he had worked so long and brilliantly, only to return to it again in *The Dolliver Romance*, his last work, of which but a few chapters had been finished at the time of his death. Those few chapters were, however, enough to show the powers of the writer at their highest, with an added grace and tenderness which was full of the most alluring promise.

In 1850 and the following year, Mrs. Harriet Beecher Stowe (known to the public only through a little series of tales published a year or two before, called *The Mayflower, or Sketches of the Pilgrims*) contributed to the *National Era*, a weekly Antislavery newspaper in Washington, a serial story with the title of *Uncle Tom's Cabin, or Life Among the Lowly*. The circulation of the newspaper was limited, and the story was brought to the attention of few beyond the usual readers. When the serial was completed, its author proposed publishing it in a volume, but found much difficulty in getting any publisher to accept it. Its publication was at length undertaken by Messrs. John P.

Jewett & Co., of Boston, and the book appeared in 1852. Its instant and extraordinary popularity must always remain one of the most remarkable among the curiosities of literature. It has been stated that more than two hundred thousand copies of the Boston edition were sold within a year from its first appearance. Its reception in England was much more astonishing. "The sale of *Uncle Tom's Cabin*," says the *Edinburgh Review*, in 1855, "is the most marvellous literary phenomenon that the world has ever witnessed. . . . The first London edition was published in May, 1852, and was not large. But in the following September the London publishers furnished to one house ten thousand copies per day for about four weeks, and had to employ a thousand persons in preparing copies to supply the general demand. We cannot follow it beyond 1852; but it is probable that by the end of that year more than a million copies were sold in England." The undoubted cleverness of this book; its variety, vivacity, and fulness of incident; its broad and striking contrasts, of exuberant fun with the most genuine and moving pathos; its picturesque description; its vivid characterizations,—are still not enough to account for such an unprecedented success. We may, perhaps, explain its popularity in the United States by remembering that the book fell upon a time when the people North and South were intensely excited upon the portentous question of slavery, then getting visibly hotter and more dangerous year by year. This book represents every form of opposition to slavery, — argument, wit, ridicule, pathos, satire, and the bullet, — and appeals with force and enthusiasm to every phase and every degree of Antislavery sentiment and opinion. And it was, strange to say, with the exception of Hildreth's *White Slave*, the first book which had attempted such a thing. For its enormous circulation abroad, its translation into every language of Europe,[1] its dramatization in twenty different forms, and its representation in the theatres of every European capital, it is less easy to account, further than as an illustration of the solidarity of the race, in virtue of which whatever stirs profoundly one portion of mankind becomes forthwith matter of interest to all the rest.

It would have been strange if such an achievement had not stimulated the author to new enterprises. In 1856 Mrs. Stowe published *Dred, a Tale of the Great Dismal Swamp*. This was, like its great predecessor, a story of slave-life, but the moral purpose of the book as an Antislavery tract was more constantly and directly enforced, and with less relief in the way of incident and variety of character. All the prestige of the author of *Uncle Tom's Cabin* was insufficient to procure for *Dred* more than a moderate and ordinary circulation. This was the last of Mrs. Stowe's Antislavery novels. She continued to write with persevering industry, but her stories were no longer stories of slavery, and were widely various in subject. *The Minister's Wooing*, *The Pearl of Orr's Island*, *Agnes of Sorrento*, *Pink and White Tyranny*, were successively printed, first as serial stories



[1] [See note to Dr. Clarke's chapter in this volume. — Ed.]

in the *Atlantic Monthly*, and afterward in book form, but without any unusual degree of favor.

Of miscellaneous works, comprising biography, travels, essays, etc., the production during the period with which we are at present concerned was, in the absence of the stimulus afforded by a prosperous and well conducted magazine, somewhat limited. Mr. R. H. Dana, Jr.'s *Two Years Before the Mast*, which first appeared in 1840, was one of the first books of travel and adventure to be published in this unadventurous community, as it has remained one of the best. Mr. Hillard's *Six Months in Italy*, a graceful, scholarly, and appreciative account of the most familiar portions of that much described country, was published in 1853; and Mr. Charles Eliot Norton's *Notes of Travel and Study in Italy*, in 1860. The latter was less the work of a tourist than Mr. Hillard's work, and more the work of a student in the by-ways of Italian art and literature, and the social and ecclesiastical history of the Italian cities. Perhaps the first contribution to the literature of Fine Art was the publication in 1850, under the editorship of R. H. Dana, Jr., of Washington Allston's *Lectures on Art*. These lectures were never read in public, and they formed but a portion of a course which was intended to cover the whole field of the theory and practice of painting.



The last literary division of the century, dating from the establishment of the *Atlantic Monthly*, has been vastly more prolific than any of the preceding divisions; too prolific, indeed, to permit so much as an enumeration here of all the writers who have sprung up and flourished. As in the second period the *North American Review* furnished the stimulus and the opportunity for the young writers of that early day, so forty years later the *Atlantic* gathered into its more varied pages the work, less formal for the most part, but more spirited and confident, of the newer generation. The new magazine was established in 1857; the first number appeared in November of that year.[1] It took at once a leading position among the literary periodicals of the country, and has steadily maintained that position. It had from the first not only the firm and judicious management of able and accomplished editors, but the cordial support of the best writers in the country on the one hand and of a large and appreciative body of readers on the other. The philosophy of Emerson; the poetry of Longfellow, Lowell, Whittier, and

[1] It was published by Messrs. Phillips and Sampson, under the editorship of James Russell Lowell. "Four volumes," says Mr. Scudder, in his preface to the index of the first twenty volumes, "covering two years and two months, were issued by this firm, when the deaths successively of Mr. Phillips and Mr. Sampson were followed by a dissolution of the firm, and the magazine passed into the hands of Messrs. Ticknor & Fields. This firm, under successive styles, continued to issue it till the close of 1873. Professor Lowell was succeeded by Mr. Fields, with whom at a later day was associated Mr. W. D. Howells, who in his turn became editor-in-chief in 1874," and in 1881 he in turn was succeeded by Mr. Thomas B. Aldrich.

Bryant; the science of Agassiz; the criticism of Weiss and Whipple, — were at its service from the beginning. Dr. Holmes, whose youthful contributions to the *New England Magazine* twenty years before were dimly remembered by the older readers, revived in the very first number of the *Atlantic* the series of papers then begun under the title of *The Autocrat of the Breakfast Table*, but revived then with the sobered wit and matured wisdom of middle age. For the first two years these delightful papers, continued under the title of *The Professor at the Breakfast Table*, and touching one after another, with wit, satire, pathos or grave reflection, every passing folly and every serious interest of the day, were to the *Atlantic* what the recreations of Christopher North were to *Blackwood*. Imbedded in them are many of the most admirable of the serious poems of Dr. Holmes, as well as many of the most amusing. They were followed by *The Professor's Story*, published later under the title of *Elsie Venner;* and this again by *The Guardian Angel*, — stories in which the interest which comes from picturesque situations and stirring incidents is by no means wanting, but in which the peculiar attraction lies in a certain curious analysis of abnormal and hereditary twists of character and disposition, which show the hand of the Professor, to whom all this pleasant story-telling is but an avocation. Dr. Holmes's contributions also included single papers on a great variety of topics, — social, scientific, biographical, — all marked by the same bright alertness, wit, and good sense.



The list of *Atlantic* story-writers is a long one, and includes some names which will long remain on the most familiar shelves. A little story which appeared in its second year, running over with delightful absurdity, purporting to be written by the Rev. F. Ingham, and called "My Double, and how he undid me," excited much curiosity as to its author, who however remained generally unknown, perhaps even till the appearance some years later of "The Man without a Country," — a sketch so vivid in its characterization, so vigorous in style, and so exactly timed to its opportunity (in the most anxious year of the Rebellion), that the *incognito* was not long preserved. Mr. Hale remained a frequent contributor to the *Atlantic* until the establishment of a magazine of his own, *Old and New*, in 1869.

Of the *Atlantic* writers, there are three who may be said to have represented in its pages not unfairly the modern school of American fiction. Of Mr. Howells and Mr. Aldrich, the first contributions to this magazine appeared in the same volume in 1860. Mr. James began some five years later. All have been constant contributors ever since of stories more or less elaborate, which have sufficient likeness to distinguish them as a group from all the earlier writers of fiction, while they have certain differences which

[1] [There is a good likeness and a sketch of Mr. Hale's career in the *Harvard Register*, May, 1881. — Ed.]

distinguish them clearly enough one from another. If Mr. Howells has more vigor of style and more incident, Mr. Aldrich has more sentiment and a more delicate touch; while Mr. James differs from both in a certain critical attitude which he maintains toward his characters, — an attitude which savors sometimes of contemptuousness or at least of a cold superiority, which is but a poor substitute for the loving sympathy which the great story-tellers have felt for the children of their imagination. More than either of the other two, more perhaps than any predecessor in the same field, his stories abound in minute details of character and manners, — of manners even more than character. But this is a peculiarity which Mr. James shares with most of the writers of fiction of our time and country, and which makes the chief element in the contrast between the modern American novel and the robust and healthy novels of English life with which Thackeray, Trollope, Reade, and Hardy, to say nothing of lesser names, have entertained the world.

The *Atlantic* has been even richer in essays than in fiction. The essays of Mr. Lowell, now on some absorbing issue of the war, or the politics of war time, now on some placid topic of curious literary study; the essays of Mr. Norton on Italian poetry or archæology; of Mr. Whipple[1] on the Elizabethan poets and philosophers; of Mr. Henry James on speculative philosophy and sociology; of Mr. C. C. Hazewell on contemporary foreign politics; of Mr. Parton on the picturesque passages of American history, biography, and manners; the admirable papers of Colonel Higginson on all sorts of familiar subjects connected with the war, and with the politics, dress, diet, manners, and social life of the day; the charming papers in which Thoreau, John Burroughs, and Wilson Flagg have set down their loving observations of the trees, birds, flowers, and the thousand aspects of the New England country, — these are but an example of the variety of interest which has gathered around the pages of this magazine during the first quarter of a century. The *Atlantic* is a favorable example, too, of the modern manner in periodical literature, which has now quite superseded the more deliberate and ponderous manner of a generation ago. The quarterlies have lost their hold on the readers of to-day, and will doubtless soon disappear. The *North American Review*, so long the type and expression of the literary character and tastes of Boston, has passed[2] from the city which fostered it for sixty years, and retains little of its original and distinctive character. The *Christian Examiner*, which maintained its place alongside the *North American* for nearly fifty years, has ceased to exist, and has left no successor. The movement of mind has shared in the larger and more



[1] [Mr. Whipple has contributed a similar, but a necessarily wider, survey than the present, in his "Century of American Literature" in *The First Century of the Republic*, New York, 1876. — Ed.]

[2] To New York.

intense activity of the present age, and brevity, vivacity, and concentration are now the first requisites in a periodical literature as in the affairs of public and private business.

Whether the ever increasing interests of business and social life in America, — of business life in particular; the amazing increase of wealth and private luxury, and the appetite which grows by what it feeds on; the disappearance everywhere of the simplicity which marked the life of the earlier half of the century, — are to conduce to the development in the future of a literature at once brilliant and ennobling, is a question not easy to answer. The connection between the conditions of popular life and the highest literary activity, in those countries of Europe which have produced the greatest examples of national literature, has always been obscure. That there is a connection is, however, undoubtedly true. The distinctive traits of the New England character are fast passing away from the New England people, swallowed up in the swelling tide of American national life. It is not unreasonable to expect that the traits which have distinguished the New England literature of the past century will be wanting in the literature of the next. "The past at least is secure." [1]



[1] [The proportion of college-bred men in Massachusetts has so decreased since 1800, that while at the beginning of the present century her students in college were approximately one in something less than 1200 of population, now there is one in about 1800 souls. See *American Antiquarian Society Proceedings*, April 24, 1878. — Ed.]

INDEX.

Contributors' names are in SMALL CAPITALS, followed by the titles of their chapters in quotation-marks, and titles of books are in *italics*. Lists of names in various chapters are not included in this Index.

ABBOTT, JACOB, 649; autograph, 649. J. S. C., 410; autograph, 410. Major Henry L., 323; portrait, 323.
Abolitionists in Boston, 369, 386.
Absentees, 175.
Academy of Notre Dame, 533.
"Adams and Liberty," song, 625.
Adams, Hannah, her writings, 641. John, 7; his portrait, 192; his house, 155; fruitful writer, 141; defends Captain Preston, 36; his brief, 38; legal adviser of patriots, 41; as "Novanglus," 133; and the newspapers, 625; and Mercy Warren, 641; letters, 642. J. Q., as writer, 642; autograph, 642; his verse, 650; and the right of petition, 384. Rev. Nehemiah, 410; autograph, 410; defends slavery, 387. Phinehas, 637. Samuel, as public writer, 140; drafts State papers, 22; writes the *Appeal*, 28; as "Vindex," 39; portrait, 35; autograph, 35; his papers, 36; his house, 158. Rev. William, 409; autograph, 409.
Adressers, 157, 175.
Agassiz, Louis, 664.
Agricultural newspapers, 633; society, 609.
Aiken, Rev. Silas, 411; autograph, 411.
Alcott, Bronson A., 657.
Alden, Judah, 231; profile drawn, by Kosciusko, 99.
Aldrich, T. B., 679, 680, 681.
Algerine War, 347.
Alien and Sedition Laws, 623.
Alien passengers, 246.
Allen, Benjamin L., acting mayor, 259. William, *Biographical Dictionary*, 642.
Allston, W., his lectures, 679.
Allston Village, 607.
Almshouse on Deer Island, 256.
American Academy, 634.
American Apollo, 635.
American Baptist Missionary Union, 428.
American Colonization Society, 388.
American Herald, 617.
American lines during the siege, 104.
American Preceptor, 644.
American Recorder, 547.
American Unitarian Association, 477.
Ames, Fisher, 197, 625, 642, 669.
Amory, John, autograph, 152. Rufus G., 303. Thomas, autograph, 152
Ancient and Honorable Artillery Company, 300, 301, 303; commanders from Boston, 301.
Andrew, John A., 392; governor, 399; references on his life, 399; autograph, 400.
Andrews, Ebeuezer T., 642. John, 155, 156, 163.
Anthology Club, 637.
Anticks, 172.
Antislavery movements, 241, 256, 260, 264, 266, 648, 652, 675, 678.
Antislavery Society, 375.
Appleton, Nathaniel, autograph, 153. William, 461.
Apthorp, Rev. East, 121.
Argus, brig, 337.
Arianism, 476.
Arminians, 467.
Armstrong, Samuel T., mayor, 243; autograph, 290.
Arnold, Benedict, in Cambridge, 114.
Artillery Election Sermons, 120.
Artillery Train, 62.
Assessments and valuations, 234.
Associators, 157, 175.
Atlantic Avenue, 272, 276.
Atlantic Monthly, 679.
Atlantic Neptune, vi.
Attucks, Crispus, 31.
Austin, James T., 384. Jonathan Loring, 183. Nathaniel, Jr., autograph, 555. William, autograph, 564.
Avery, John, autograph, 153.

BACK BAY, plan in 1814, x; land agreement, 261.
Bacon, Rev. John, 126.
Bagna'l, Thomas, 439.
Bainbridge, Commodore William, 338, 349, 351, 355; commands the "Constitution," 341; autograph, 352.
Baldwin, Loammi, 212, 355; autograph, 557. Rev. Thomas, 423.
Balfour, Rev. Walter, 499; autograph, 499.
Ballou, Rev. Hosea, 492; portrait, 493; autograph, 493. Hosea, 2d, 50; autograph, 502.
Bancroft, George, 654, 665; autograph, 665.
Baptists in Boston, 421; in Brighton, 605; in Charlestown, 561, 563; Social Union, 432; in Roxbury, 581.
Barker, Josiah, 356.
Barras, autograph, 166.
Barré, Colonel Isaac, defends the Colonies, 11; autograph, 11; his portrait asked for, 19.
Barrett, Colonel James, autograph, 103. Jonathan, autograph, 153.
BARROWS, SAMUEL J., "Dorchester in the last Hundred Years," 589
Bass, Bishop Edward, 449, 454.
Bartholomew, Rev. J. G., autograph, 502.
Bartlett, Josiah, 547; autograph, 548. Gen. William F., 318; portrait, 318.
Bates, George, 348.
Baylies, Hadijah, autograph, 213.
Beachmont, 616.
Beacon, 25, 171, 184; Hill, panorama from, 79; Street in 1804, 225.
Beaurain, vi.
Beecher, Laban S., 357. Rev. Lyman, 408; portrait, 408; autograph, 408.
Belknap, Jeremy, 473; autograph, 635; as a writer, 640.
Bellingham Estate in Chelsea, 615.
Bells, ringing of, 243.
Benevolent Fraternity of Churches, 477.
Benjamin, Park, 652.
Benneville, Rev. George de, 483.
Bent, Rev. N. T., 458.
Bernard, Governor, 27; his house, 117; sails for England, 28.
Berniere, ii.
Betterment law, 272.
Bible in the public schools, 535.
Bigelow, Horatio, 627. Dr. Jacob, 645. John P., mayor, 254; autograph, 291. Timothy, autograph, 213.
Bingham, Caleb, 644.
Binney, Amos, 339, 439.
Bishop's palace, 106.
Bliss, George, autograph, 213.
Block, Rev. William, 435.
Blockade of Boston, a play, 162.
Blowers, S. S., 38; autograph, 38.
Blunt, x.
Boardman, Rev. Richard, 435.
Boies, James, 117.
Bolles, Rev. Dr., 460.

Bolton, Commodore William C., 349.
Bond, William, autograph, 105
Borland House, 106.
Boston, city, incorporation of, 219, 222; city government organized, 224; charter amended, 246, 248, 259, 260, 278, 282, 293; bicentenary of, 236, 291; water-board, 285; in the Civil War, 316; descriptions of, 168; maps of, i–xii, — by Trumbull, 80; population, increase of, 292, — during the siege, 92, (in 1783) 168, 190, (in 1810) 303, (in 1820) 221, (in 1830) 234, (in 1850) 255, (in 1860) 264, 312, (in 1880) 278; independence proclaimed, 183; rolls of troops, 118; siege of, 67; life in, 91, 154; plundered, 76; evacuated, 94, 163, 180; approaches fortified, v. 79, 182; authorities on siege, 78, 154; literature of siege, 117; views of town, 23, 156.
Boston, frigate, 187, 334; sloop-of-war, 354.
Boston harbor, exploits in, during the Revolution, 90; plans of, i–xii; preservation of, 263; views of, 23.
Boston Highlands, 588.
Boston institutions: Boston Athenæum, 638; Boston College, 536; Boston University, 441.
Boston Light, viii, 96.
Boston massacre, 31–40; orations, 40, 135, 635.
Boston military: dragoons, 303; light infantry, 303
Boston Port Bill, 52; donations to the town, 54.
Boston publications: *Almanac*, xi; *Atlas*, 629; *Catholic Observer*, 527; *Chronicle*, 617, 623, 626; *Courier*, 628; *Evening Transcript*, 630; *Directory*, vii; *Gazette*, 132, 137, 617, 623, 624; *Herald*, 630; *Magazine*, 636; *Miscellany*, 663; *Patriot*, 626; *Pilot*, 534; *Post*, 629; *Recorder*, 632; *Times*, 630; *Traveller*, 630; *Weekly Magazine*, 643.
Bounties in the Civil War, 315; evils of, 325.
Bowditch, Nathaniel, 641.
Bowdoin, James, 141; autograph, 39; in poor health, 76; his house, 155; during Shays's rebellion, 193; his portrait, 195.
Bowen, Abel Francis, x, 663.
Bowes, William, autograph, 153.
Boylston, John, 178; Nicholas, 152.
Bradford, Duncan, 357. Samuel, 303.
Brattle, Thomas, 110. William, 62, 110; Estate in Cambridge, 110.
Brattle Street meeting-house, 92, 106, 158.
Breck, Samuel, 155, 171.
Breed, Ebenezer, autograph, 555.
Bridge, Eben, autograph, 106. Matthew, autograph, 557.
Bridge to Charlestown, 554.
Brighton, annexed, 284, 603; churches, 604; noted citizens, 610.
Brimmer, Martin, mayor, 249; autograph, 290
Brinley house in Roxbury, 116.
Broad Street riot, 245.
Broadway Bridge, 276.
Brook Farm, 577, 579, 585.
Brooks, Major John, 83, 105; autograph, 83
Brooks, Phillips, "The Episcopal Church," 447, 463.
Brotherhood of St. John, 460.
Brown, Box, 393. Gawen, 154. Samuel, 336, 337.
Brown's house, 80.
Brown of Ossawattomie, 399.
Brownson, O. A. 660; his *Quarterly Review*, 660; his *Boston Quarterly Review*, 660.
Brush, Crean, 97.
Bryant, William C., 643, 650.
Buckingham, Joseph T., 628, 629, 631; autograph, 631.
Buckminster, Rev. J. S., 475; portrait, 475.
Budington, Rev. W. I., 412, 560; autograph, 412, 561.
Bugbee, James M., "Boston under the Mayors," 217.
Buildings, survey and inspection of, 281; destroyed during the siege, 155.
Bulfinch, Charles, 517. Dr. Thomas, 450, 452.
Bunker Hill, fortified, 82, 181; battle, 82; British morning orders, 84; command in, 103; plan of battle, i; view of battle, 87, 88; view of field, 555; loss in Charlestown, 104, 549; prisoners taken, 89; its centenary, 287; literature of, 103; orderly books, 84; monument, 88.
Bunker Hill Aurora, 547.
Bunker Hill Monument Association, 566.
Burgoyne, General, arrives, 81; autograph, 81; writes plays, 93, 161; dies, 100; his army in Cambridge, 183; their parole, 184; in Boston, 155.
Burns, the fugitive, 260, 397, 398.
Burrill, Samuel, 437.
Burying-ground redoubt in Roxbury, 114.
Bussey, Benjamin, 583; his farm, 572.
Bute's ministry, 8, 12; autograph, 13.
Butcher's Association in Brighton, 608.
Butler Hill, 106.
Byles, Mather, 126, 160; his daughters, 160; his estate, 161. Mather, Jr. 128, 448.
Byrne, Rev. Patrick, 519; autograph, 519.
Byrne, William, "The Roman Catholic Church in Boston," 515.

Cabot, George, 626; autograph, 213; portrait, 214.
Cadets, 300, 303.
Caldwell, James, 31.
Callender, Joseph, ix.
Cambridge, assembly at, 27, 41; bridge, xi; plan of, xi.
Caner, Rev. Henry, 128, 448
Canterbury, 572.
Carleton, Osgood, viii, ix; autograph, viii.
Carney, Andrew, 539.
Carney Hospital, 539.
Carroll, Bishop, 517; autograph, 517.
Carter farm, 615.
Cary, Nathaniel, autograph, 153. Richard, autograph, 152.
Cary farm, 615.
Castle, burned, 180; surrendered to the military, 41.
Castle Island, ix.
Catechising, 469.
Cathedral of the Holy Cross, old, view of, 516; sold, 536; the new, 536, 544.
Catholics, burials of, 528; in Charlestown, 564. *See* Roman Catholics.
Cattle fair in Brighton, 607.
Cemeteries in Brighton, 609; in Roxbury, 586
Chalkley, Robert, 552.
Chamberlain, Mellen, "Chelsea, etc., in the last hundred years" 611
Channing, W. E., 637, 646; his Unitarianism, 474; joins Abolitionists, 377, 383.
Chapin, Rev. E. H., 492, 500; autograph, 492.
Chapman, Jonathan, mayor, 247; autograph, 290.
Charities, 470; in Roxbury, 585.
Charles River, xii; bridge, 554.
Charlestown, 547; annexed, 284, 570; battery, 306; schools, 557; meeting-house built, 558; tree, vi; loss in, during the battle on Bunker Hill, 86, 549; town clerks, 551; view of, in 1789, 554; other views, 555; made a city, 569; public library, 569; mayors of, 569; maps of, ii, iv, vii, viii, x, xi, xii, 568.
Charlestown artillery, 307.
Chastellux in Boston, 167.
Chatham, Earl of, autograph, 65.
Chauncy, Rev Charles, 122, 471, 488.
Checkley, Rev. Samuel, Jr., 125.
Chelsea, 611, 616; bridge, 555; maps, xi, xii; naval hospital at, 351.
Chesapeake frigate, 341; and Shannon, 344.
Chestnut Hill reservoir, 272.
Cheverus, Bishop, 516; autograph, 518; portrait, 518.
Child, David Lee, 377. Lydia M., 378, 648.
Chocolate Manufacture, 595.
Cholera in Boston, 255.
Christ Church in Cambridge, 110, in Boston and the lanterns, 101.
Christian Disciple, 479, 646.
Christian Examiner, 479, 645.
Christian Register, 480, 633.
Christian Witness, 633.

Chronicle, 130.
Church, Benjamin, Jr., active, 44, 145; autograph, 111, 145; his defection, 111.
Church of the Advent, 458.
Church Street District, 274.
Cincinnati Society, 621.
City Clerk, 225.
City Hall (old State House), 235; (old Court House), 247; new one erected, 267, 272.
City Hospital, 262.
City Seal, 225.
Civil War (1861–65), Brighton's share, 603; acts of Charlestown, 565; Dorchester in, 596; Roxbury's share, 578; necessitated illegal registration, 267; quota of Boston, 271; its effect on newspapers, 629.
Clapp, Deacon Ebenezer, 593. William W., 627.
Clarendon Hills, 572.
Clark, John, 439. Silas, 612.
Clarke, James Freeman, "The Antislavery Movement in Boston," 369. Rev. John, 471.
Clay, Henry, his visit (1833), 602.
Cleaveland, Parker, 645.
Clouston, John, 188.
Clinton, General, arrives, 81; autograph, 81; dies, 100.
Cobb, Samuel C., mayor, 284; autograph, 291. Rev. Sylvanus, 504; autograph, 504.
Cobble Hill, 105.
Cochituate Water, 252.
Codman, Rev. John, 407, 594; autograph, 407.
Coffin, William, autograph, 153.
Colby, Gardner, 430.
College-bred men, 682.
Colonies, union of, 20.
Color printing, x.
Columbian Orator, 644.
Columbus Avenue Church, 501.
Commandant's house at Navy Yard, 337.
Commercial Point, 595.
Committee of Correspondence, 42; their doings, 55; their records, 182.
Committee of Safety, 77.
Common, British works on, 79; cows on, 236; Soldiers' Monument on, 324.
Concord, Expedition to, 67, 101. *See* Lexington.
Confiscation Acts, 175.
Congregational Churches, 401; in Charlestown, 563; in Dorchester, 594.
Congregationalist, 633
Constellation, frigate, 340.
Constitution of the U. S. adopted, 196.
Constitution, ship, 332, 337, 340, 341; docked and rebuilt, 356; figure-head of Jackson, 357.
Constitution of Massachusetts (1780), 148, 192, 613.
Constitutional Telegraphe, 624.
Continental Congress, 55.
Continental Journal, 617.
Convention troops, 184, 323.
Conway, General, his portrait asked for, 19.
Cooper, Rev. Samuel, 123. William, town clerk, 28, 33; clerk of Committee of Correspondence, 44; autograph, 44.
Coquette, The, a novel, 604, 637.
Cordis, Joseph, autograph, 554.
Cotton, John, 402.
Court House, 243.
Craft, Ellen, 393.
Crafts house in Roxbury, 586.
Craigie, Dr. Andrew, 113.
Craigie house in Cambridge, 112.
Crane, William B., autograph, 352
Croswell, Rev. Andrew, 129. Rev. William, 456, 459.
Cudworth, Benjamin, 14.
Cumberland, frigate, 354, 362.
Cunard line of steamships, 247.
Cummings, Charles A., "Press and Literature of the last hundred years," 617.
Cushing, Thomas, 144, 145; autograph, 29, 34; portrait, 34
Customs officers, 3.
Cutter, Leonard R., acting mayor, 284. Samuel, 557.
Cutler, Rev. Timothy, 128.

Daily, first, in Boston, 627.
Daily Advertiser, 626, 627.
Dalrymple, Colonel, 25.
Dana, R. H., Sr., 649; autograph, 649; his *Buccaneer*, 649; *Idle Man*, 649. R. H., Jr., his writings, 679; autograph, 679.
Dane, Nathan, autograph, 213.
Danforth, Thomas, 551.
Datchet house in Roxbury, 116.
Davis, Aaron, 587. Rev. John, 127. Thomas A., mayor, 250; autograph, 290. William, 117.
Davy, Solomon, autograph, 153.
Dawes, William, sent to Lexington, 68, 101.
Dean, Rev. Paul, 490, 496, 497; autograph, 498
Deane, frigate, 187.
Dearborn, Benjamin, x. Henry, ii, 105, 116, 574; portrait, 574. H. A. S., 575. Nathaniel, xi.
Debt of the city, 225, 234, 240, 247, 249, 251, 252, 255, 264, 278, 288; act for regulating extent, 286.
Dedham turnpike, 576.
Derby, Richard, autograph, 103.
Des Barres, J. F. W., iii, vi.
Deserters, 91.
D'Estaing in Boston, 185.
Devens, Chas., autograph, 551. Richard, 549; portrait, 550; autograph, 101, 550. Samuel, autograph, 551.
Dewey, Samuel P., 359.
Dexter, Franklin, autograph, 557. Samuel, 211, 557; autograph, 557.
Dial, 656.
Dickens, Charles, in Boston, 248.
Dickinson, John, 22, 131.
Doane, Rev. G. W., 456.
Dodge, David, autograph, 551.
Donkin's *Military Collections*, 74.
Doolittle, Colonel Ephraim, autograph, 107.
Dorchester, 589; schools, 591; churches, 592; annexed, 277, 598; population, 599; plan of, x, xii; heights occupied, 94; Neck, 117; fortified, 117; Neck annexed, 597; Neck, plan of, v.
Dorchester, Daniel, "The Methodist Episcopal Church," 423.
Douglass, Frederick, 393.
Downes, Commodore John, 361; autograph, 352.
Dowse, Edward, 38.
Draft riot (1863), 269.
Drake, F. S., "Roxbury in the last hundred years," 571; "Brighton in the last hundred years," 601.
Drama in 1814, 308.
Draper, Moses, 572. Richard, 130.
Drum, or rout, 161.
Dry Dock, 354, 356.
Dudley, Colonel Joseph, 573. Paul, his mile-stones, 585
Dudley estate, 576.
Duel, 185; Finch and White, 349.
Dupee, Elias, 160.
Dutton, Warren, 625.
Dwight, Rev. S. E., 410. Lieut.-Colonel Wilder, 322; portrait, 322.
Dyer, Micah, 440.

East Boston, plan of, ix, xi. Ferries, 277, 288.
Eastburn, Bishop, 460, 464.
Eaton, Rev. Asa, 454.
Eckley, Rev. Joseph, 406, 470; autograph, 406.
Edes, Benjamin, 624. Henry H., "Charlestown in the last hundred years," 547. Robert B., autograph, 552. Thomas, Jr., autograph, 552
Edes house in Charlestown, 552; view of, 553.
Edes & Gill, 132, 617.
Edwards, Rev. Justin, 409; autograph, 409.
Election sermons, 120.
Eliot, Dr. Andrew, 91, 124, 159. Dr. John, 471; his *Biographical Dictionary* 642. Samuel, autograph, 152. Samuel A., mayor, 243; autograph, 291; portrait, 214.
Elliot, Commodore Jesse D., 355, 356; autograph, 352.
Ellis, Rev. George E., D. D., 563. Rev. Sumner, 490.
Elmwood, 113, 114
Emancipation group, 292, 400.
Embargo, 209, 636, 643.
Emerson, R. W., 477, 655, 663; as lecturer, 659; his poetry, 673. Rev. William, 637.

Emmanuel Church, 462.
Episcopal Church, 447; in Brighton, 605; in Roxbury, 581; clergy in the Revolution, 127; controversy, 121.
"Era of good feeling," 626.
Erving, John, Jr., 152.
Essex, frigate, 341.
Essex Gazette, 138.
Eustis, Governor, 112; his house, 575; autograph, 575; attends wounded of Bunker Hill, 111.
Evening Post, 131.
Everett, Alexander H., 645. Edward, 380, 670; as clergyman, 475; his portrait, 671; autograph, 671. Rev. L. S., 491; autograph, 491. Rev. Oliver, 472.
Evergreen Cemetery, 609.

FADEN, WILLIAM, iii; his maps, 80.
Falmouth, sloop of war, 354.
Faneuil Hall, a theatre during the siege, 161; portraits in, 181; view of, 228.
Farm School, 241.
Farmer's letters, 22.
Fay, S. P. P., 307.
Fayerweather house in Cambridge, 113.
Federal Constitution, reports of meeting to adopt, 622; adopted, 196.
Federal Gazette, 627.
Federal Orrery, 625
Federal Street widened, 277; meeting-house, 158.
Federalists in Boston, 189, 623; their decline, 207; revival, 207; final extinction, 215; authorities on, 214, 215.
Felch, Cheever, 348, 350.
Fellowes Athenæum, 583.
Fenwick, Bishop, 519.
Fessenden, T. G., 633.
Finch, Lieutenant William B, duel, 349.
Fires, in 1787, vii; in 1794, viii; in 1872, 281; legislation after, 295.
Fire department, 229, 243, 246; telegraphic fire-alarm, 256; steam fire-engines, 256; reorganized, 282; of Roxbury, 584; engines, 151, 152
Fisher, William, autograph, 153.
Fitch, Timothy, autograph, 152.
Fitzpatrick, Bishop, 526; autograph, 526; died, 539.
Flag, naval, 188; used at the siege, 105.
Fleet, John, 131. Thomas, 131.
Follen, Charles, 654.
Food scarce during the siege, 157.
Forest Hill Cemetery, 577, 586
Fort Hill, view of, 23; removed, 272.
Fort Independence, 305; Strong, 310, 311; Warren, 306.
Forton, prisoners at, 187.
Foster, Rev. John, 604. Mrs Hannah, 637; her novel, *The Coquette*, 604.
Fowle, Zachariah, 134.
Foxcroft, Rev. Thomas, 122.
Frankland, Lady, 77.
Franklin, Benjamin, before parliament, 18; agent of Massachusetts Bay, 41.
Freeman, Rev. James, 450, 472; portrait, 473.
Freemasons, 585.
Free-soil party, 389, 390.
French army in Boston, 165; their entertainment, 166.
French officers, autographs, 166.
French Revolution, influence of, 203, 623.
Friends' monthly meeting, 64.
Frolic, sloop-of-war, 343
Frothingham, Benjamin, autograph, 559. Rev. N L, 476. Hon Richard, 566; autograph, 566; his "Sam Adams Regiments," 29.
Fuel scarce during the siege, 156.
Fugitive-slave law, 397.
Fuller, Margaret, 656, 657; autograph, 656.
Fulling mill, 587.

GAGE, THOMAS, made Governor of Massachusetts Bay, 54; seizes powder, and begins fortifications, 62; sends out expeditions, 66; and his wife, 68; his account of Lexington and Concord, 73; his order to inhabitants to leave Boston, fac-simile, 76; reinforced, 81; dies, 100.
Gamage, Dr. William, Jr., autograph, 112.
Gannett, Rev. E. S, 476.
Gardiner, Rev. J. S. J., 452, 625; portrait, 453, 456.
Gardner, Rev. Calvin, 491; autograph, 491. Henry J, 258.
Garretson, Rev. Freeborn, 435.
Garrison, William Lloyd, 371, 632; portrait, 373.
Garrison mob, 241, 381.
Gaston, William, mayor, 279; autograph, 291.
Gates, General in command in Boston, 185.
Gates and Carter duel, 185.
Gaylord, Rev. N. M., 490.
General Repository, 479.
German literature, influence of, 653, 660.
Gerry, Elbridge, autograph, 211.
Gerrymander, 212.
Gibbs, Major Caleb, 348.
Gill, Moses, autograph, 205.
Glen, James, 510.
Glover, Colonel John, autograph, 113.
GODDARD, D. A., "The Pulpit, Press, and Literature of the Revolution," 611.
Goodnow, Elisha, his gift, 262.
Goodrich, S. G., 649.
Goodwin, Mrs., keeps Washington's house, 113.
Goodwin's ship-yard, 187.
Gorham, Nathaniel, 549; autograph, 549.
Governor's Island, 306, 310.
Grades at South End raised, 274.
Grafton, Duke of, 21; autograph, 21; Rev. C. C., 460.
Grant & Dashwood, 618.
Grape Island affair, 100.
Grasse, Comte de, autograph, 166.
Graves, Admiral, 80; autograph, 81
Gray, Rev. F. T., 498. Harrison, Jr., autograph, 153. Samuel, 31. Thomas, autograph, 152. Rev. Thomas, 581. Hon. William, 314.
Gray's ropewalk, 30.
Greaton, Rev. James, 128. General John, 116; autograph, 116.
Green, Jonathan, 612, 613. Joseph, the wit, 178; his portrait, 132; autograph, 152. Rev. Samuel, 411; autograph, 411.
Greene, General Nathanael, 117; autograph, 105, 118; in command in Boston, 182. Nathaniel, autograph, 153.
Green Dragon Tavern, 64.
Greenleaf, Joseph, 136. Rev P. H., 461. Stephen, 14, 25. William, autograph, 29.
Greenwood, Rev F. W. P., 476.
Gregory, Commodore F. H., autograph, 352.
Grenville, George, autograph, 8.
Greyhound Tavern, 131, 584.
Gridley, Jeremy, 4. Richard, 82, 83; constructs defences in Cambridge, 106.
Griffin, Rev. E. D., 407; autograph, 407.
Griswold, Bishop, 454, 458.

HALE, EDWARD E., "The Siege of Boston," 67; his writings, 680; autograph, 680. Nathan, as editor, 627; autograph, 628.
Hales, J. G., x.
Hall, Rev. Nathaniel, 593.
Hallowell, Benjamin, 179; autograph, 153.
Hamilton, Alexander, statue of, 206.
Hancock, John, 144; character of, 170, 200; autograph, 153, 200; portrait by Revere, 45, 46; delivers Massacre oration, 54; acts as major-general, 185; during Washington's visit (1789), 197, 199; his house, 155, 200, 201; his cottage at Jamaica Plain, 203; defeats Bowdoin, 194.
Hannah Corcoran riot, 531.
Harbinger, 663.
Harbor defences in War of 1812, 305. *See* Boston Harbor.
Harper, Rev. John, 438.
Harris, Isaac, 332. Thaddeus Mason, 592, 641; portrait, 593.
Hartford, Farragut's flag-ship, 363.
Hartford Convention, 212; autographs of members from Massachusetts, 213.
Hart's ship-yard, 332.
Harvard College buildings during the siege, 107.
Hastings, Jonathan, 107, 109.

Hawthorne, Nathaniel, 676; his autograph, 676.
Haxtun, M., autograph, 353.
Hazard, ship, 186.
Health, Board of, 279.
Heath, General, in command in Boston, 183; his likenesses and homestead, 183; made general, 65; autograph, 65
Heath estate, 576.
Hedge, F. H., 660.
Helpless Orphan, 636.
Henchman, Daniel, 31.
Henshaw, Joshua, autograph, 152.
Henson, Father, 393.
Hewes, Shubael, 157, 179.
Hildreth, Richard, 667; his *History of the United States*, 668.
Hill, Alexander, autograph, 152. Rev. William, 510.
Hillard, George S., 384, 396; his writings, 679; autograph, 679.
Historical writers, 664.
Hodgson, John, stenographer, 38.
Hog Island, 78, 80.
Hog-reeves, 218.
Holbrook, Samuel, autograph, 551.
Holden, Oliver, autograph, 570.
Holland, Samuel, surveyor, iii, vi.
Hollis Street meeting-house, 158.
Hollowell, Robert, 179.
Holmes, Abiel, 641. Oliver Wendell, 650; his prose writings, 680; his poetry, 674.
Holmes house in Cambridge, 108.
Home Journal, 584.
Hooper, Robert, 56. Rev. William, 128.
Hopkins, Captain, 184 Rev. J. H., 456.
Horse railroad, 577.
Horticulture, 595
House of the Angel Guardian, 530, 534, 536.
House of Industry, 230.
Howard, Rev. Simeon, 121, 472.
Howe, General, arrives, 81; autograph, 81; his proclamation, 97; his troops, 163; his quarters, 155. Rev. Joseph, 126. Rev. M. A. DeW., 456. Samuel G., 302, 398, 651, 664; autograph, 664.
Howells, W. D., 679, 680, 681.
Hubbard, Daniel, autograph, 153.
Hudson, W. L., autograph, 353.
Hughes, Samuel, autograph, 152
Hull, Commodore Isaac, 307, 339, 340, 341, 351; portrait, 339; captures the "Guerrière," 339, 340, 341; autograph, 352; commands the Navy-yard, 347.
Humphreys, Deacon Henry, 593.
Hunt, Rev. John, 126.
Huntington, Rev. F. D., 462. Rev. Joshua, 406.
Hurd, Joseph, autograph, 554
Hutchinson, Eliakim, 179. Thomas, chief-justice, 4; his house sacked, 14; becomes acting-governor, 28; and the massacre, 33; becomes governor, 41; letters made public, 44; his house at Milton, 48; recalled, 54; as writer, 145.
Hyde Park, 595.

Inches, Henderson, autograph, 153.
Independence, line-of-battle ship, 343, 346 348; razeed, 361.
Independence proclaimed in Boston, 183; copies of the printed declaration, 183.
Independent Advertiser, 133.
Independent Chronicle, 138; fac-simile, 139.
Independent Ledger, 617.
Inman, Ralph, autograph, 106; his house, 106.
Insane, hospital for, 246.
Intrepid, torpedo-boat, 344, 365.
Ivers, James, 450.

Jackson, Francis, 383.
Jail, 253, 255.
Jamaica Pond aqueduct, 237, 573.
James, Henry, Jr., 680.
Jarvis, Samuel, 621. Rev. S. F., 455.
Jay's treaty, 204, 564
Jeffries, Dr. John, 87.
Jenks, Rev. William, 407; autograph, 407.
Johnson, Oliver, 372.
Johonnot, Francis, 337, 339.
Judd, Sylvester, his *Margaret*, 676.
Judson, Rev. Adoniram, 428.
Julien, the caterer, 575.
Junketing, 268.

Kemble, Charles, in Boston, 628.
Kettell, John, autograph, 551.
King, Henry M., "The Baptists in Boston," 421. Rev. T. F., 492; autograph, 492. Rev. T. Starr, 492; autograph, 492.
King's Chapel, 450, 472.
Kirk, Rev. E. N., 412; autograph, 412.
Kirkland, Rev. J. T., 472.
Kneeland, Rev. Abner, 491; autograph, 491.
Know-nothing party, 527.
Knox, Henry, his family, 31; sees the massacre, 31; portrait, 95.
Kosciusko, 99.

Lafayette in Boston, 173, 185, 231, 575, 602; autograph, 173.
Lamb's Dam, 114, 573.
Lamb Tavern, 93.
Lamps in streets, 152.
Land Commissioners, 258.
Lane, Oliver W., 489.
Lathrop, Rev. John, 125, 471.
Lauzun, autograph, 166.
Law books, sale of, during Revolution, 138.
Lawrence, Abbott, 345; his house, 232 Captain James, 344.
Leach, John, vii, 552; autograph, 552.
Learned, Colonel Ebenezer, autograph, 117. Thomas, 104.
Leather manufacture, 587.
Lechmere, Richard, 106; his house, 113.
Lechmere's Point, 106.
Lecture system, 658.
Lee, General Charles, autograph, 105. Rev. Jesse, 434, 436. Joseph, autograph, 153; his house, 113.
Lee papers, 29.
Legislature, Boston in the, 298; grants to Boston institutions, 298; coöperates with Boston in improvements, 298; gifts to the city, 298.
Leonard, Daniel, 132; autograph, 133.
L'Etombe, 166.
Lewis, Rev. S. C., 447.
Lexington, march to, 67, 101; Gage's account of, 73; relics of, 74; plan of, 102; authorities, 102.
Liberator, newspaper, 372, 632.
Liberty, Hancock's sloop, 23.
Liberty party, 389.
Liberty song, 131.
Liberty tree, 12, 16, 19, 28, 45, 159; view of, 159.
Libraries in Brighton, 606; in Charlestown, 569.
License law, 248, 254, 286.
Lighthouse burned, 90, 182.
Life in Boston in the Revolutionary period, 149.
Lillie, Theophilus, 30.
Lincoln, Frederick W. Jr., mayor, 262; again elected, 268; autograph, 291 General B., autograph, 194.
Lincoln statue, 400.
Linsley, Rev. J H., 410.
Linzee, Captain John, 83, 106.
Literature of the last hundred years, 617, 634.
Little, Captain George, 187, 335. Captain Luther, 187
Little Sisters of the poor, 541.
Lloyd, Henry, autograph, 152. James, 209.
Lodge, Henry Cabot, "The last forty years of Town Government," 189.
Long, John D., "Boston and the Commonwealth," 293.
Long Lane meeting-house, 471.
Longfellow, Stephen, autograph, 213. Henry W., 672; his poetry, 672; draft of his "Excelsior," 673; his house, 112.
Loring, Ellis Gray, 377. Joshua, 179
Louis Phillippe in Boston, 624.
Lovejoy, E. P., killed, 384.
Lovell, James, autograph, 160. John, autograph, 160. General Solomon, 185; autograph, 185.
Lowell, Colonel Charles R., 321 James Russell, his poetry, 673; his autograph, 674; his house, 113, 114. John, Jr., 574.
Lowell estate in Roxbury, 576.
Lowell Institute, 658.

Loyalists, 175; abandon Boston, 191; writers, 145; corps of, formed, 77.
Lyman, Joseph, autograph, 213. Theodore, mayor, 237; portrait, 237; autograph, 290; and the Garrison mob, 382.
Lynde, Benjamin, presided at the massacre trials, 38; autograph, 38.
Lynde's Point, 567.

MACCARTY FARM, 576.
Maffitt, Rev. J. N., 438.
Magazines, 636.
Magee, Captain James, 575.
Magnifique, ship wrecked in Boston harbor, 88.
Malcom, Daniel, 23; autograph, 152.
Malden bridge, 555.
Manly, John, commissioned, 90; autograph, 90; captures ordnance, 106.
Mann, Horace, 652.
Manwaring, Edward, 38.
Maps of Boston, i–xii.
Marshfield, troops at, 65.
Mason, Rev. Charles, 464. David, 62. Jonathan, autograph, 29, 153.
Masquerade, 161.
Massachusetts Centinel, 617, 626; laws of Congress in, 624.
Massachusetts Gazette, 130.
Massachusetts Magazine, 635, 637.
Massachusetts Mercury, 625.
Massachusetts Quarterly Review, 663.
Massachusetts Spy, 134, 617; facsimile, 135; removed to Worcester, 137.
Massachusetts Baptist Education Society, 430.
Massachusetts Fusileers, 303.
Massachusetts Historical Society, 635.
Massachusetts State papers, 145.
Massachusetts, ship, 331.
Massachusettensis, essays, 133.
Mather, Rev. Samuel, 126; autograph, 127.
Matignon, Rev. F. A., 516; autograph, 519.
Maverick, Samuel, 31.
May, Samuel J., 379.
Mayhew, Father, 529. Jonathan, 119; and the Stamp Act, 20, 467, 484
McAlpine, Daniel, 160.
McCleary, Samuel F., father and son, 225.
McLean Asylum for the insane, 567.
Means, Rev. James H., 594.
Meeting-house hill in Roxbury, 577; in Dorchester, 594.
Mein, John, 30, 151; autograph, 131
Mein & Fleming, 130.
Merchant's autographs, Revolutionary period, 152.
Merrimac, frigate, 362.
Methodist churches, 423; in Brighton, 605; in Charlestown, 563; in Roxbury, 582; School of Theology, 441; Social Union, 442.
Mexican war, 311, 565, 664.
Middlesex canal, 556; horse railroad, 556.
Mifflin, Thomas, v; quartermaster-general, 110.
Miles, Rev. James B., 412; autograph, 413.
Militia, 303, 328.
Mill-dam, 575; plan of, in 1814, x, xi.
Miller's Hill, 105.
MINER, A. A., 500; "Century of Universalism," 483.
Minot, George R., autograph, 194.
Missions by the Baptists, 428.
Missionary Herald, 646.
Mitchell, Rev. Edward, 490; autograph, 490.
Mohawks of the tea-party, 49.
Montgomery, J. B., autograph, 353.
Monthly Anthology, 479, 637.
Montresor, ii, iii
Moore house in Cambridge, 110.
Moorhead, Rev. John, 129.
Morgan, Daniel and his riflemen, 104. John T., 332
Morris, Commodore Charles, 341; autograph, 352.
Morse, Rev. Jedediah, 406, 471, 474, 560; autograph, 407, 560; his writings, 561; controversy with Hannah Adams, 560, 641. S. F. B., birthplace, 255; autograph, 553. Sidney E., 632.
Motley, J. L., 671; autograph, 671. William W., 438.
Mount Hope Cemetery, 586.
Mount Pleasant, 576.
Muddy Pond, 572.
Mugford, Captain, 182.
Murray, Rev. John, 484, 489; portrait, 486; autograph, 486.
Murray's barracks, 31
Mystic River, xii; water works, 569.

NANTASKET ROADS, British fleet driven from, 182.
National Lancers, 300.
Naval hospital, 351; school, 348; service during the Revolution, 118, 186.
Navigation acts, 9.
Navy agent, 336.
Navy-yard established, 335, 556; the original purchase, 337; plan in 1823, 342; ship-houses built, 344; plan in 1827, 350; plan in 1874, 366.
Neale, Rev. R. H., 426.
Neck, defences on the, 80; views of, 80.
Neponset River, 595.
New England club of loyalists, 175.
New England, maps of, i
New England Chronicle, 138.
New England Galaxy, 628, 631.
New England Guards, 307, 342, 345, 346.
New England Magazine, 651.
New England Methodist Historical Society, 442.
New Jerusalem Church, 509.
New York Herald, 630.
Newman, Robert, 101.
News-Letter, 130.
Newspapers, 617; taxed, 621.
Nichols, E. T., autograph, 353
Nicholson, John B., autograph, 352. Commodore Samuel, 333, 334, 338; autograph, 352.
Nixon, John, autograph, 105.
Nix's Mate, i.
Non-importation agreement, 29, 41, 150
Nooks Hill, 97.
Norcross, Otis, 272; mayor, 273; autograph, 291.
Norfolk County Journal, 584
Norfolk Gazette, 583.
Norfolk Guards, 584.
Norfolk House, 576.
Norman, J., iv, vii, ix
North, Lord, 26; autograph, 26.
North American Review, 638, 643, 663.
North Chelsea, 616.
Norton, Professor Andrews, 477. Charles E., his writings, 679.
Novanglus Essays, 133.
Novel, first American, 636.

OCEAN SPRAY, 616.
Odd Fellows, 585.
Ogden, Rev John C., 449.
Old and New, 680.
Old Ironsides, 337.
Old North, 156.
Old South, 156, 158.
Old State House made a City Hall, 235.
Oliver, Andrew, as a writer, 146; portrait, 43; autograph, 43; hung in effigy, 12; his oath of resignation, 15. Andrew, Jr., 146. Peter, autograph, 43. Thomas, his house, 113, 114; family, 43.
Otheman, Anthony, 440.
Otis, Harrison Gray, 194, 204, 303; as a boy, 70; mayor, 234; portrait, 235; autograph, 213, 235, 290. Mrs. Harrison Gray, 315. James, argues against writs of assistance, 4; portrait 6; autograph, 6; his *Statement*, 10; proposes a congress, 12, 15; fac-simile of letter, 20; active, 25; as a writer, 140.
Overseers of the poor, 271.
Oxnard, Thomas, 340, 341.

PADDOCK, ADINO, 62; autograph, 62. Bishop, 464.
Page, Lieutenant, iii.
Paige, Rev. Lucius R., 503; autograph, 503.
Paine, Rev. Joshua, Jr., 560. Robert Treat, 144, v; in massacre trials, 36; autograph, 144. Thomas, 625.
Palladium, 625.
Panics of invasion, 165
Paper mill, 595.
Papists, warrant against, 169.
PALFREY, GENERAL F. W., "Boston Soldiery in War and Peace" 303;

in service, 326. John G., 476, 646; Abolitionist, 377, 395.
Park Street, view of, 232.
Parker, Foxhall A., autograph, 352, 353. John, autograph, 74. Rev. Samuel, 128, 447, 450, 454. Rev. Theodore, as theologian, 478; as minister, 581; an Abolitionist, 392, 393; portrait, 394; autograph, 394; references for life, 394; as lecturer, 659.
Parkman, Francis, his histories, 668.
Parks proposed, 284; in Roxbury, 586.
Parrott, E. G., autograph, 353.
Parsons, T. W., 676.
Parting stone, 585.
Patriots among the country gentry, 191; imprisoned, 154.
Payne, Edward, autograph, 29, 152.
Payson, Rev. Phillips, 551, 611, 612, 615; autograph, 551. Samuel, 551, 557; autograph, 558.
Paxton, Charles, autograph, 4.
Peabody, A. P., "Unitarians in Boston," 467. Rev. Ephraim, 479.
Peacock Tavern, 117.
Peace of 1815, 213.
Peace extra of 1783, 174.
Peck, John, 186.
Pelham, Henry, his map of Boston, ii; autograph, iii.
Pemberton, Rev. Ebenezer, 125. Samuel, autograph, 39.
Penobscot expedition, 185.
Pennsylvania, constitution of, 139.
Pepperell, Sir William, the younger, 179.
Percy, Earl, arrives, 56; letters, 57, 101; portrait, 58; autograph, 58; his headquarters, 155; at Lexington, 70; his retreat, 75.
Peter Parley, 649.
Phelps, Rev. A. A., 411.
Phillips, John, mayor, 90, 224; portrait, 223; autograph, 290. Wendell, 376, 384. Willard, 638; autograph, 639. William, 38; autograph, 29, 153.
Phips family, 111.
Phips's farm, 106.
Pierce, Henry L., mayor, 281; again elected, 288; autograph, 291.
Pierpont, John, 377, 650; autograph, 650.
Pierpont's village, 571.
Pigot, General, 84; autograph, 84; his quarters, 155.
Pillmore, Rev. Joseph, 435.
Pillory, 173.
Pilot, 633.
Pine-tree flag, 188.
Pitcairn, Major, 102, 103; killed, 87.
Pitt and the Stamp Act, 17.
Ploughed hill, 104.
Polar Star, 627.
Police, city liable for their acts, 300; department of, 245, 246, 252, 259, 266; reorganized, 289.
Pond Plain, 571.
Poole, Charles, 551.
Port-captain, 348, 353.
Porter, Edward G., "The beginning of the Revolution," 1. Rev. Eliphalet, 580.
Post Boy, 130.
Poterie, Abbé de la, 515.
Potter, Rev. Alonzo, 456.
Powars, E. E., 617.
Powars & Willis, 138.
Powder tower, 105.
Power of Sympathy, 636.
Preuile, Admiral George H., "The Navy and the Charlestown Navy Yard," 331. Jedediah, 64; autograph, 64.
Prentice, Rev. Thomas, 559, 562; autograph, 562.
Prescott, William (Judge), autograph, 213. Colonel William sent to Bunker Hill, 82; autograph, 82, 115. William H., 666; autograph, 666; view of his library, 667.
Press of the last hundred years, 617; of the Revolution, 130.
Preston, Captain Thomas, 31; his trial, 36, 38.
Price Lectures, 452.
Priest, John T., 551.
Prince, Frederick O., mayor, 287; again elected, 290; autograph, 291.
Princeton, U. S. Steamer, 362.
Prisoners taken by the British, 187.
Privateers in the Revolution, 90, 92, 118, 182; in the war of 1812, 340.
Prohibitory liquor law, 254.
Prospect Hill Camp, 105.
Protector, ship, 187.
Provincial Congress, 63, 65, 107.
Public Garden act, 263.
Public Institutions, directors of, 262.
Pulling, John, 101.
Pulling Point, 612, 616.
Punch-bowl village, 571.
Pulpit of the Revolution, 119.
Purkett, Captain Henry, 303.
Puseyism, 458.
Putnam, Dr. Aaron, 336; autograph, 556. Rev. George, 479, 581. Israel, autograph, 80; at Prospect Hill, 105; in command in Boston, 182.

Quincy, Edmund, 376. Josiah, Jr. (patriot), law reports, 5; defends Preston, 36; his portrait, 37; autograph, 37; speech on tea, 49; "Hyperion," 142; on Port bill, 142. Josiah (President), 142, 307; and embargo, 209; opposed city charter, 221; mayor, 226; portrait, 227; statues, 227, 291; autograph, 290. Josiah (the younger), mayor, 251; autograph, 290. Samuel, 36, 179, 191.
Quincy market, view of, 228.

Railroad, to the Hudson, 234.
Railroad jubilee, 257.
Railroads opposed, 596.
Rand, Dr. Isaac, autograph, 555.
Randall, Rev. G. M., 461.
Rangers, 307.
Ransom, George M., autograph, 353.
Rawdon, Lord, 87.
Read, John, 572, 575.
Reed, B. T., 465. David, 633. Rev. James, 510; "New Jerusalem Church," 509. Colonel Joseph, autograph, 113. Sampson, 510.
Registration of voters, 286.
Regulation acts, 53, 55.
Relly, Rev. James, 484.
Reporting, early, 622.
Republican party (early), 623.
Republican volunteers, 303.
Revenue laws, 8, 41.
Revere, Paul, 310, 332, 337; and his lanterns, 101; his transparencies, 135; in the Penobscot Expedition, 186; his ride, 68; portrait, 69; autograph, 69; engraves paper money, 69; his plan of King Street, 39; his illuminations of the massacre, 40; portrait of Hancock, 45, 46; mission to New York, 50; his "Able Doctor," 55. Major Paul J. 318; portrait, 319.
Revere, town of, 611, 616.
Revolution, beginning of, 1.
Rhode Island Expedition, 185.
Rice, Alexander H., mayor, 261; autograph, 291.
Rich, Isaac, 439.
Richards, Rev George, 488.
Richardson, Ebenezer, 30.
Ripley, Rev. George, 477, 603.
Robin, Abbé, in Boston, 168.
Robinson, Rev. J. P., 461.
Rochambeau, autograph, 166.
Rocking stone, 586.
Rockingham ministry, 16,
Rodgers, Admiral John, autograph, 353.
Rogers, Jeremiah Dummer, 180, 562. Rev. William M., 411; autograph, 411.
Roman Catholics, 515; in Brighton, 605; in Roxbury, 582.
Romans, B., v.
Romney, man-of-war, 23.
Roslindale, 572.
Rousselet, Rev. Louis, 515.
Rowe, J., autograph, 152.
Rowson, Mrs. Susannah, 643.
Roxbury, in the last hundred years, 571; two hundred and fiftieth anniversary, 575; a city, 577; mayors of, 578; annexed, 275, 579; churches, 580; schools, 582; noted citizens, 588; maps of, viii, x, xi; old parsonage in, 115, 116; American lines in, 114; forts, 115, 116.
Roxbury artillery, 584.
Roxbury Athenæum, 583.
Roxbury city guard, 584.
Roxbury City Gazette, 584.
Roxbury horse guards 584.
Royall, Isaac, 111; his mansion, 105.
Ruddock, John, 437.

Ruggles, George, his house, 113. Timothy, 77; autograph, 77.
Ruggles estate in Roxbury, 576.
Russell, Major Ben., 617; autograph, 619; portrait, 619; his *Gazette*, 625. Thomas, 113; autograph, 153, 564. Walter, autograph, 551.

Sack, John, 614.
Salem, Leslie's expedition to, 65.
Salt pans, 587.
Salter, Richard, autograph, 152.
Saltonstall, Dudley, 186.
Sandeman, Robert, 129.
Sanitary measures, 226.
Sans Souci Club, 620.
Sargent, Epes, 630; autograph, 630. J. O. 651.
Saturday, beginning of Sunday, 169.
Saturday Evening Gazette, 631.
Savage, James, 646.
Scammell, Alexander, autograph, 105.
Schools, 231, 249, 254; in Brighton, 605; books used in, 642, 644; in Charlestown, 557; in Dorchester, 591.
Scott, John, autograph, 152.
Scudder, Horace E., "Life in Boston," 149.
Sea-fencibles, 311.
Seabury, Bishop, 449.
Seamen's Bethel, 438.
Seaver, Benjamin, mayor, 258; autograph, 290.
Seavems, Joel, farm, 586.
Second Massachusetts Regiment in the Civil War, 325.
Sedgwick, Catharine M., 647; autograph, 648.
Select Journal of Foreign Periodical Literature, 654.
Selectmen, origin of, 218.
Selfridge trial, 207.
Sewall, Jonathan, 36, 132, 133; as writer, 146; his house, 113. Rev. Joseph, 125. Samuel, autograph, 554. Samuel E., 372, 377.
Sewall's farm, 114.
Shaw, Lemuel, drafts city charter, 222. Colonel Robert G., 321; portrait, 321. Samuel, 38, 331; autograph, 38.
Sharp, Rev. Daniel, 425.
Shays's Rebellion, 193, 194, 572, 622.
Shedd, A. B., 551.
Sherburne, Joseph, autograph, 153.
Ship-yards, 187.
Shirley Hall, 575.
Shubrick, William B., 349; autograph, 352.
Shurtleff, Nathaniel B., 261, 273; mayor, 276; autograph, 291.
Shurtleff farm, 615.
Silloway, Rev. T. W., 491.
Silver, Rev. Abiel, 509.
Simms, the fugitive, 256, 397.
Sisters of Charity, 520; of the Good Shepherd, 540; of Notre Dame, 529, 532.
Skinner, Rev. Otis A., 504; autograph, 504.
Skillman, Rev. Isaac, 127, 423.
Slavery in Massachusetts, 370.
Sleeper, Jacob, 439.
Small-pox, 163, 612.
Smith, Isaac, 72; autograph, 29. Jerome V. C., mayor, 259; autograph, 291. Ralph, 587.
Snider, Christopher, 30.
Snow, Jeremiah, 549.
Snowden, Rev. Samuel, 440.
Society of the Holy Redeemer, 544.
Soldier's monument on the Common, 324.
Solemn league and covenant, 55.
Somerville incorporated, 568.
Song of Liberty, 144.
Sons of Liberty, 11, 12, 13, 19, 26, 29, 150.
Southack, Cyprian, viii.
South bay, xii; lands, 253.
South Boston, 597; plan of, xi; flats, 273. *See* Dorchester Neck.
Southgate, Rev. H., 460.
Sparks, Jared, 647; autograph, 647; his writings, 647; his library, 647.
Sparhawk, Edward, 603.
Spears used during the siege, 116.
Spicer, William F., autograph, 353.
Spinnets, 154.
Spooner, John, autograph, 153. J. J., 584.
Sprague, Charles, 651; autograph, 649. Captain Richard, 559.
Spry, Rev. Christopher, 438.
Stamp Act, 9; cut of stamp, 12; schedule of prices, 12; congress, 12, 15; riot, 14; in parliament, 17; repealed, 19; rejoicings in Boston, 19.
Stark, John, at Bunker Hill, 88; autograph, 89.
State-aid to soldiers, 315.
State and City, 293; large tax paid by Boston to the State, 296.
State prison, 567; mutiny at, 351.
State-reform School at Westboro', 241.
Stearns, George L., 398.
Steedman, Charles, autograph, 353.
Steuben, Baron, 185; autograph, 185.
Stevenson, General Thomas G., 317; portrait, 317.
Stillman, Rev. Samuel, 127, 423; portrait, 422.
Stone, Rev. John S., 457.
Storer, Ebenezer, autograph, 29, 153.
Story, Joseph, his verse, 643. W. W., 676.
Stow, Rev. Baron, 425.
Stowe, H. B., her *Uncle Tom's Cabin*, 396; her writings, 677; autograph, 678.
Streeter, Rev. S., 490; autograph, 490.
Street commissioners, 278.
Streets, widening of, cost, 273.
Stringham, Commodore S. H., autograph, 352.
Strong, Caleb, autograph, 205.
Suburban News, 584.
Sudbury River water, 280.
Suffolk County in the Civil War, 313.
Suffolk resolves, 59.
Suffolk Street district, 274.
Sugar duties, 10.
Sullivan, Captain George, 345. James, 626; autograph, 208. General John, autograph, 104. William, 380.
Sumner, Charles, 390; portrait, 391; references for his life, 392; assaulted, 398. Increase, autograph, 204.
Sunday-schools, 405.
Sutherland, George, 439
Swan, Samuel, autograph, 551.
Swedenborgians, 509.
Swedenborg's belief, 511.
Swett, Captain Samuel, 346.
Syckes, John, 614.
Symmes, Major Andrew, 183.

Talleyrand in Boston, 624.
Tarbox, I. N., "The Congregational Churches," 401.
Tea sent to Boston, 44; arrives, 45, 46; meetings held, 47; minutes of the meetings, 49; thrown into the harbor, 49; names of the actors, 50, 51; sources of information, 51.
Ten-hills farm, 104.
Ternay, Chevalier de, autograph, 166.
Thacher, Oxenbridge, 4, 10, 144. Peter, autograph, 103.
Thayer, Ephraim, 332. Rev. John, 515; autograph, 515. Rev. T. B., 504; autograph, 504.
Theatricals during the siege, 161.
Thomas, General, 78; made general, 65; autograph, 65; builds fort at Roxbury, 116. Isaiah, 134, 642; his *History of Printing*, 642. Joshua, autograph, 213.
Thompson, Rev. Amos G., 438. George, 381. Rev. J. S., 491; autograph, 491. Samuel, viii, ix.
Thoreau, H. D., 658.
Thursday lecture, 159, 164, 402, 469.
Town-meetings, 174.
Towns, origin of, 217; government of, 218; can be incorporated as cities by the legislature, 220.
Townshend, Charles, 8, 21, 26.
Ticknor, George, 661, 667; statuette of, 661; autograph, 661; his *Spanish Literature*, 661; view of his library, 662; his house, 232.
Ticonderoga, cannon from, 106.
Tigers, New England guards, 300.
Tithing men, 154.
Tractarian movement, 458.
Tracy, Nathaniel, 113; entertains French officers, 166.
Transcendentalism, 477, 654, 658.
Tremont Street in 1800, 451; opened, 576.
Tremont Temple, 431.
Trinity Church, 456; ruins of, 457.
Troops sent to Boston, 23, 25, 26, 56, 64.

Trumball, Timothy, 551, 557; autograph, 557.
Trumbull, John, v; his plan of Boston and vicinity, 80.
Tucker, Captain Samuel, 182, 187.
Tuckerman, Rev. Joseph, 477, 615.
Tudor, William, 144, 453, 637, 638; autograph, 141, 184, 185.
Tufts, Charles, founder of Tufts College, 555. Nathan, autograph, 555. Samuel, 557.
Tufts College, 500; House, 105.
Tukey, Francis, 252; discharged, 258.
Turner, Rev. Edward, 491; autograph, 491. Captain William, 303.
Twentieth Massachusetts regiment, 318, 326.
Tyrannicide, brig, 187.

Union Club, 232.
Unitarian Review, 479.
Unitarians, 450, 467, 646; table of churches, 480; in Brighton, 605; controversy, 561; in Dorchester, 594; in Roxbury, 581.
United States Intelligencer, 520.
Universalists, 483; their first meeting-house, 489; publications, 507; in Brighton, 605; in Charlestown, 562; in Roxbury, 581.
Universalist Magazine, 497.
Urquart, James, autograph, iii.
Ursuline Convent established, 519; destroyed by a mob, 238, 521, 564; view of, 522; references upon, 524; indemnification, 532.

Vassall, Henry, iii. Colonel John, 111.
Vassall house in Cambridge, 111.
Vaubiard, Admiral, in Boston, 188.
Vermont, line-of-battle ship, 344, 354.
Vinton, Rev. A. H. 460.
Viomenil arrives, 165.
Virginia, line-of-battle ship, 354.

Wadsworth, Alexander, x. General Peleg, 186; autograph, 186.
Wadsworth house, 106; view of, 107.
Waldo, Daniel, autograph, 213. Joseph, autograph, 29.
Walker, Rev. James, D. D., 562; autograph, 562. Timothy, autograph, 567. Dr. William J. autograph, 552.
Walter, Rev. William, 129.
War of 1812, 211, 303, 626.
War of Secession, 312; men furnished by Boston, 315.
Ward, Artemas, made general, 64; autograph, 64; portrait, 109, 186; commands in Roxbury, 116 Judge Artemas, 562. Colonel Joseph, 86.
Warden & Russell, 617.
Ware, Henry, Sr., 474. Rev. Henry, Jr., 476.
Warner, Jonathan, 573.
Warren, Dr. John, autograph, 112; surgeon of Cambridge Hospital, 112. Joseph, as a writer, 142; massacre oration, 65, 142; fac-simile of it, 143; his sword, 143; autograph, 39, 60; his birthplace, 59; lived on Hanover Street, 59; portrait, 60; other likenesses, 61; family, 61; burial, 61; his wife's portrait, 63; Chairman of Committee of Safety, 77; killed, 88; statue of, 566. Mercy, 149; her writings, 641.
Warren Association, 426.
Warren bridge, 555.
Warren Phalanx, 307, 552.
Warren, sloop-of-war, 354.
Warren Tavern, 558.
Washington takes command, 90; at Dorchester Heights (by Stuart), 98; his writings, 647; proclamation of, 181; headquarters in Cambridge, 106; visits Boston (1789), 197, 349, 559, 573; Hancock's conduct towards, 197, 199; reception arch, 200; portraits (Athenæum head), 198; other likenesses, 199; monuments to, 199.
Washington Elm, 109, 110.
Washington, Fort, 106.
Washington Light Infantry, 303.
Washington Medal, 100.
Washington Street, 199.
Washington Village, 595, 598.
Watchman and Reflector, 633.
Water-power Company, 261.
Water-supply considered, 238, 249, 250, 251; introduced, 252, 256.
Waterhouse, Samuel, 132, 151.
Wayland, Rev. Francis, 426.
Webster, Daniel, 628; autograph, 670; his seventh of March speech, 396; refused Faneuil Hall to speak in, 257; his statue, 232. Grant, 135.
Wednesday Evening Club, 168.
Weekly Advertiser, 130.
Weekly newspapers, 631.
Weeks, Rev. J. W., 447.
Weld, Stephen M., 583.
Wells, Charles, mayor, 236; autograph, 290. Rev. E. M. P., 457, 461.
Welsh Fusiliers, 56, 80.
Wesleyan Association, 441.
West Church, 158.
West Roxbury, 117; set off, 577, 578; annexed, 284, 580.
Western Railroad opened, 248.
Wheatley, Phillis, 147; autograph, 147.
Whipping-post, 172.
Whipple, E. P., 681; autograph, 681.
White farm, 576.
Whittemore, Rev. Benjamin, 503; autograph, 503. Rev. Thomas, 497; autograph, 497.
Whittier, J. G., 650; his poetry, 675.
Wightman, Joseph M., mayor, 265; autograph, 291.
Wilde, Samuel S., autograph, 213.
Wilder, Marshall P., 596.
Willard, Solomon, autograph, 566.
Willard's clocks, 587.
Williams, John Foster, 186, 187, 188. Bishop J. J., 530, 533, 539; made archbishop, 543. Daniel, 551. Jonathan, autograph, 153. Joseph, 572. Richard, iv. Dr. Thomas, 576.
Williams farm in Chelsea, 615.
Willis, Nathaniel, 632.
Willis's creek, 105.
Winchester Home for Aged Women, 570.
Winnisimmet Ferry, 615.
Winship mansion in Brighton, 602, 608.
Winship's nurseries, 607.
Winslow, Rev. Hubbard, 412. Isaac, autograph, 153. John, autograph, 152.
Winslow Blues, 303.
Winter Hill, 104, 105.
Winthrop, John, statue of, 291; his *History of New England*, 646. Robert C., chairman of the Overseers of the Poor, 272. Thomas L., 224.
Winthrop, town of, 611, 616.
Wise, Rev. John, 122.
Wisner, Rev. B. B., 409; autograph, 409.
Withington, Matthew, viii, ix.
Woman's Foreign Missionary Society, 442.
Wood, David, 552. David, Jr., 562 Josiah, autograph, 552.
Worcester, Rev. Noah, 607. Rev. Thomas, 509.
Writs of assistance, 2, 4, 21, 140.
Wyman, Thomas B., autograph, 566.

Young, Rev. Alexander, 476.
Young & Etheridge, 625.

Zion's Herald, 441, 633.

University Press: John Wilson & Son, Cambridge.

UC IRVINE LIBRARIES
3 1970 01923 3532

UC SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY
D 000 916 545 7